-Tonia M. Harris OCR-USDC/EDVA 703-646-1438-

-Tonia M. Harris OCR-USDC/EDVA 703-646-1438-

## PROCEEDING

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

14

2.4

2 | (Court proceedings commenced at 10:04 a.m.)

THE COURT: Back on the record. The United States of America versus Melvin Palma Flores. Representatives from the government are present. Mr. Jenkins is present along with Mr. Melvin Palma Flores.

The Court adopts, by reference, the statement it has made at the beginning of the trial regarding the steps taken to deal with the circumstances we're all facing through the pandemic.

Is there anything we need to do before we bring the jury in?

MR. JENKINS: I'll go ahead and raise it.

MR. BEN'ARY: Okay, go ahead.

MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. May it please the

16 | Court, Your Honor. Robert Jenkins on behalf of the defendant,

17 | Mr. Melvin Palma Flores. Your Honor, this morning I

18 | anticipate that the defense will present the testimony of

19 Mr. Melvin Palma Flores in his own defense. And in doing so,

20 | Your Honor, we intend to offer a piece of evidence which I

21 | suspect the government would object, and I believe that the

22 | Court would appreciate us resolving this issue prior to

23 Mr. Palma Flores beginning his testimony.

Your Honor, the evidence specifically would be a

25 | letter, a handwritten letter, in which Mr. Palma Flores was --

2.4

would testify was received by him while he was detained at the Fairfax Adult Detention Center as a consequence of his arrest for the allegations which the Court has heard some testimony about from Ms. Sheehy as well as Detective Wallace about a certain domestic assault situation that occurred, I believe, in December 2019. And shortly after his detention there he received this letter from Ms. Sheehy which does two things, Your Honor.

Number one, throughout the letter -- and we do have copies for the Court -- Ms. Sheehy is explaining why she's upset with the defendant, the many things that the defendant has done to anger her. But most significantly, Your Honor, in the letter she goes on to talk about how the charges that have been placed against the defendant -- and we believe she was referring to those domestic assault charges -- are false -- I'm sorry, Your Honor.

This is -- the defendant was not detained at the Fairfax Adult Detention Center but the Alexandria Detention Center when he received this letter, so I am corrected.

Nevertheless, Your Honor, in the letter she also indicates that the charges against the defendant are false and that she was threatened with the same being done to her, that is, we would infer false charges being placed against her.

THE COURT: Let me interrupt you and just make sure I have the context of everything. I'm assuming from what

- you're saying, and again correct me if I'm wrong, that this is not something that was in the possession of the government so, therefore, it's exculpatory. You're not suggesting that, are you?
  - MR. JENKINS: I'm not suggesting that at all, Your Honor. In fact, I have every reason to believe that the government just learned of its existence this morning when I made the disclosure to them about it.

THE COURT: Okay.

2.4

MR. JENKINS: In the letter, Your Honor, as I said, because she suggests -- or it says that the charges against Mr. Palma Flores are false, and that she was threatened with the same. We believe the -- the proper interpretation is false charges being placed against her. The Court may recall that Detective Wallace was asked on cross-examination -- well, on redirect as to whether or not she had coerced Ms. Sheehy into making the disclosures to her concerning Mr. Palma Flores' alleged criminal conduct, and Detective Wallace denied doing so.

The Court may also recall that in Government Exhibit 34, the purported letter from Mr. Palma Flores to Ms. Sheehy -- in that very same letter he suggests that she testify that, in fact, she was coerced by Detective Wallace.

THE COURT: When did you get this letter?

MR. JENKINS: Your Honor, I became aware of the

1 letter this morning.

THE COURT: Okay. Another problem that's raised -- and again I'm going to hear from the government, but another problem that's raised is that, I would assume based upon your competence and ability, that if you had known about this letter, you would have used it in some way to --

MR. JENKINS: I would have confronted Ms. Sheehy and I would have also --

THE COURT: -- confront her and challenge her?

THE COURT: Again, this is why I'm thankful that I take good notes. Now, Ms. Sheehy is compromised -- Sheehy, I believe, is the correct pronunciation -- is compromised because she came back in the courtroom yesterday and I made a note of it and listened to part of the trial, which is a violation of the rule against witnesses.

MR. JENKINS: That is absolutely true, Your Honor, as I understand it based on what the Court shared with us on yesterday. And the Court is correct, that if I was in a position to do so, I would have found this to be useful.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. JENKINS: Yes.

MR. JENKINS: In my cross-examination of Ms. Sheehy and perhaps even Detective Wallace. But, nevertheless, I wasn't in a position to do so. But now that it has been shared with me, Your Honor, certainly Brady would have

- obligated the government, if it had it, to share it with me.
- 2 | They didn't have it.

- THE COURT: Right.
- 4 MR. JENKINS: But the law still is clear that the 5 defendant has a right to present favorable evidence.

Now, I know that the timing of it should give the Court concern, and I'm certain the government is going to raise some other evidentiary rule challenges to it also. But I think that this is a very significant piece of evidence and that the Court could first permit Mr. Palma Flores to testify about. He certainly, I believe, can testify he's familiar with Ms. Sheehy's writing. He can testify as to whether or not it's his opinion whether or not it is hers, whether or not he received it, and the contents of the letter and his understanding of what is in it. And the jury can certainly give what weight to it as it sees fit.

If the Court is concerned or troubled by the fact that ordinarily it would be proper for me to confront Ms. Sheehy about what is purported in this letter and give her an opportunity to either embrace it or deny it. Then on behalf of Mr. Palma Flores, I would ask that the Court permit us to recall Ms. Sheehy for that limited purpose.

The Court has already expressed some concerns given her violation of the rule on witnesses. And in response to that, I would ask that the Court then consider declaring a

mistrial in this matter so that once again --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

THE COURT: Let me stop you there. This is your client. Again, I'm not assessing any blame to you whatsoever, Mr. Jenkins. You know how much I respect your work. But your client needs to understand that this is not trial by ambush. If he has something that's helpful to his case, he has a responsibility if he wants to help his case, to let you know about it in a timely fashion so that we can conduct a litigation. And he can't, on the back end, present something to you that is critical, from his perspective, to his case and then if I don't allow it claim that he's entitled to a mistrial. He's approbating and reprobating. He's suggesting 13 that we do one thing, holds back on something, and then wants 14 a remedy because of something that he did.

MR. JENKINS: And I certainly appreciate that, Your Honor. Without revealing any confidence, let me suggest this to the Court -- or offer this to the Court. It is certainly conceivable to me that Mr. Palma Flores did not understand the import of the contents of this letter until such time that Ms. Sheehy and Detective Wallace both had testified.

THE COURT: I would have to think that he's very unsophisticated if he does not understand the significance of having a letter, which is contrary to the testimony of a key witness in the government's case.

MR. JENKINS: I certainly understand that, Your

- Honor. And then the second thing that I would offer is that certainly Mr. Palma Flores was confronted, since last evening, with a very important decision about whether or not to exercise his right to testify under the Fifth Amendment. And in preparation for doing so, I certainly can imagine that Mr. Palma Flores took it upon himself to try to review everything that might be in his possession that could be helpful or useful in his own testimony. And he's not a lawyer, so he may not have understood the evidentiary of limitations on how something like this letter could be used and also the rules governing -
  THE COURT: Again, Mr. Jenkins -- and the trouble
  - that the Court has is simple. The government's case is part circumstantial and part direct. A critical part of the government's case is the testimony of Ms. Sheehy.

MR. JENKINS: Yes.

2.4

THE COURT: And I am sure, based upon your level of preparation and your discussions with him, you had some idea of the significance of the testimony of Ms. Sheehy. And it would seem to me to be reasonable is that if your client is in possession of a document, which theoretically or potentially undermines the testimony of a critical witness of the government, that he would have at least made you aware of it.

MR. JENKINS: And I understand that, Your Honor, and I would just query this. If -- you know, if it was through

can have a look at it.

either a woeful act or if it was just negligence or just the fact that he just didn't recognize its import, I think the focus of the Court should be is it weighty enough? Is it significant enough to impact the credibility of the key witness in this case? I would submit such that the jury should be denied its benefit. And I just would suggest to the Court that it is of such significance that it calls for extraordinary steps to ensure that this young man has every opportunity to present favorable evidence in his defense to this jury, which is going to make the ultimate call as to whether or not this Court is going to be empowered to sentence this young man to as much as life in prison without the possibility of parole. So I would ask the Court to give due consideration to it in light of the gravity of the moment.

MR. BEN'ARY: Your Honor, thank you. Let me begin by just giving the Court a little bit of context. I'm trying to digest this letter as well, but as best I can tell, there's one line that's relevant in here and it says: "They put all those false charges on you and wanted to do the same to me." That's it. It doesn't say what charges, it doesn't say why they're false, it doesn't say who put the false charges -
THE COURT: Somebody hand up the letter so that I

MR. BEN'ARY: It doesn't say who put the false charges on. So it is -- it is of such slate probative value,

Your Honor, that I would suggest that it is -- it should not be admitted. And here are the basis for not admitting the letter, and the line I'm focusing on is the bottom of the first page there.

The first reason that this should not be admitted,

Your Honor, is because it is clearly in violation of the

Court's discovery order. The government has taken great steps

over months, years to provide the defense with access to

information, objects, letters in its possession that would be

part of its case. The Court's discovery order requires

reciprocal discovery on that. I'm not blaming Mr. Jenkins. I

understand he just got it this morning, but it's in his

client's possession, should be deemed in the possession of the

defense, and we have not been given access to it. So

accepting it into evidence would be a violation of the

discovery order and should not be admissible on that basis.

The better argument, Your Honor, is I think that there are rules about examining a witness and impeaching a witness with that witness's prior statement. The letter that you have in front of you is extrinsic evidence of a prior inconsistent statement. Rule 613, Federal Rules of Evidence, (b), sets forth the rules for using extrinsic evidence of a prior inconsistent statement. And it says, "Extrinsic evidence of a witness's prior inconsistent statement is admissible only if the witness is given an opportunity to

explain or deny the statement, and an adverse party is given an opportunity to examine the witness about it."

Ms. Sheehy was not given the opportunity to explain or deny the statement. She is no longer a witness in the case. She was released. She is not -- she has been released from subpoena. She is not here. And even if she were here, she has been in violation of the rule on witnesses. So the rules of evidence do not permit the introduction of this prior -- this extrinsic evidence of Ms. Sheehy's prior inconsistent statement. And given the extremely slight evidentiary value of this letter, I would submit that there is no cause for the Court to go against the Federal Rules of Evidence and allow its admission at this point in the game.

THE COURT: All right, sir. Let me take a moment, Mr. Jenkins, to read the letter.

MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor.

(A pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Jenkins.

MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. Your Honor, I would like the opportunity just to respond to the government's points. First and foremost, I think that the letter is -- it s value goes beyond simply the one line making references about the false charges. In the beginning of the letter, Your Honor, the writer says, "Your dad knew me and Katie had court and I asked him to help us get advice from a lawyer because

they wasn't treating us fairly."

2.4

Mr. Palma Flores would testify that, as the government has adduced throughout the course of this trial, with respect to Government's Exhibit 34 and 35, that these two individuals, when exchanging letters, often used code words and names to suggest other individuals that they did not want others to know who they were talking about.

Mr. Palma Flores would talk about -- would testify that the "Katie" referenced in this sentence is actually Mr. Kollin Worlds who testified, who the Court, I'm sure, can appreciate the defense in this case is that there were three people in the car outside of Mr. Brown's apartment complex. One got out, committed the shooting, and then the three departed.

The government maintains that the individual who did that was Mr. Palma Flores, while we maintain it was Mr. Kollin Worlds. And that when the writer indicates that "Katie," again, Kollin Worlds, and her had court, she's referring to engagements or meeting with law enforcement, and that "they" that were not treating them fairly is law enforcement. And that she's upset that the defendant, while getting himself proper legal counsel, was not taking any steps to ensure that they also had proper legal counsel. So it not only goes to the coercion issue --

THE COURT: Hold on, Mr. Jenkins.

Ladies and gentlemen, you need to make a decision as to whether you're going to be in the courtroom or not be in the courtroom. We cannot have you interrupting the process as we're going through it this morning, or at any other time during the course of this proceeding. So if you're going to make a decision to be in here, you're expected to stay in here unless there is an emergency until we take a break.

Thank you, Mr. Jenkins.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Your Honor.

excuse me, of the letter. Also, because again our defense theory is that Ms. Sheehy and Mr. Worlds were coordinating their efforts to shield themselves and to blame the defendant for what Mr. Worlds had did -- excuse me -- did in perpetrating the offense. In the letter, she also, Your Honor, goes on to talk about -- excuse me -- Court's indulgence --

(Counsel and Defendant confers.)

MR. JENKINS: She goes on to the top of the second page, Your Honor, and she writes, "You think I was going to sit behind bars pregnant for someone who never gave a shit about me?"

Again, Mr. Palma Flores would interpret this as

Ms. Sheehy telling him that she's not going to get in trouble

in trying to protect him or do anything that might help him if

1 | that causes her any legal difficulties.

And so we think that the letter goes beyond just the one sentence that might be favorable and just overall -- overall -- the Court has now had the benefit to read it in its entirety. Clearly the writer of this letter is angry with the person who the letter is being directed to. And we think that actually goes to bias also.

So we believe --

THE COURT: All those things -- and again

Mr. Jenkins, all of those things are very good points, but the timing of it is what is problematic for the Court. You weren't given the opportunity to conduct the proper cross-examination of Ms. Sheehy because your client made the decision to not give you information which was advantageous to his case. This isn't something where we can sort of say, well, how can anybody understand that this would be advantageous. This is pretty simple. This is evidence that's critical -- allegedly, critical to the testimony of a significant witness of the government. And now we have a situation where you're suggesting, as an advocate, that we somehow get around Rule 613(b). How do we do that at this point?

MR. JENKINS: Well, Your Honor, certainly I think the remedy is to permit the defense to recall Ms. Sheehy.

Now, I understand the rule on witness. But, Your Honor, for

- this limited purpose, I don't think there's any testimony that she could have heard that would shape or impact her ability to answer: Did you write this letter?
- THE COURT: Let me ask you this, is Ms. Sheehy here?

  MR. JENKINS: She is not here today. But, Your

  Honor, this trial was scheduled, as the Court informed the

  panel, that jury selection is for five days.
  - I specifically say, "Is this witness subject to recall?" I do that every time. It's almost rote for the Court. And when I asked both government and you, as representative of Mr. Flores, was this witness subject to recall, every single time, "No." There was not one witness that I can recall, correct me if I'm wrong --

MR. JENKINS: That's right.

with her having sat in the courtroom and heard at least a portion of the trial, the fact that she was not subject to recall, the fact that your client gives you something on the eve of his testimony, which is, in his view, critical to his case, puts the Court at a very big disadvantage and it's inconsistent with the formal statement of the rule.

MR. JENKINS: And I certainly understand that, Your Honor. But I think the purpose of the rule on witness is to prevent a witness's testimony from being colored by hearing

other testimony in the case. And if she was going to be examined by the defense on any issue or any testimony that she may have overheard, I would appreciate why the rule needs to be strictly enforced. But that's not the situation we are confronted with here today. She's simply -- in order to comply with the rule -- be given the opportunity to be confronted with the letter. She can say I wrote the letter, or I didn't write the letter. I think her examination would be very limited in scope, Your Honor. And once she's had the opportunity to do so, depending on what her answer is, I think even the government may concede, depending on what her answer is, that then Mr. Flores can have the letter introduced either through her or through his own testimony.

THE COURT: She was in the courtroom, not through some arguably extraneous witness. She was in the courtroom during the testimony of Detective Melissa Wallace who is the case agent in the case.

MR. BEN'ARY: And can I just add one point on contact with other people involved in the trial? According to the Alexandria Sheriff's Department, Mr. Palma, the defendant, and Ms. Sheehy spent over an hour on the phone last night. I don't see how she's recalled at this point. This is a situation caused by the defendant. It will open up a whole can of worms. Ms. Sheehy sent a series of text messages to Detective Wallace last night as well claiming she can't

believe Mr. Palma is going to trial, saying that he is guilty.

She can't believe he's blaming it on Kollin. And, you know,

are we going to then reopen our case in rebuttal to put that

all in. It's just opening up a whole can of worms for a

letter that has essentially severely limited probative value

and it would be in violation of the rules of evidence.

THE COURT: Okay.

- 8 I'll give you the last word, Mr. Jenkins.
- 9 MR. JENKINS: I'm sorry, Your Honor?
- 10 THE COURT: I'll give you the last word, sir.
  - MR. JENKINS: Your Honor, I don't think I have anything further to add. I think the Court understands the position. I do concede that it would -- introduction of the letter at this point would be contrary to the rule, but we do believe that there is a remedy available to the Court, albeit an extraordinary one. But in light of the significance of the matter, we would ask the Court to exercise its discretion.
  - THE COURT: All right. The Court believes that based upon the circumstances outlined, which have previously been articulated that apparently Mr. Palma Flores presented this significant letter to his lawyer at -- on the eve of the last day of trial and the application of Rule 613(b) and the fact the Court made a specific record of finding that

    Ms. Laila Sheehy was in the courtroom from approximately 2:35 to 2:43 during the testimony of Detective Melissa Wallace, and

- 1 | that there are other extraneous matter, which also give the
- 2 | Court great concern and that in the exercise of discretion, it
- 3 | is not going to allow the admissibility of this particular
- 4 letter.
- 5 Mr. Jenkins, I note your exceptions.
- 6 MR. JENKINS: Your Honor, will the letter, for
- 7 | appellate purposes, be made a part of the record?
- 8 THE COURT: I'll have the deputy clerk mark it and
- 9 then I will make a record of denying to its admissibility.
- 10 MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 11 THE COURT: All right.
- 12 Mr. Palma -- I'm sorry. I'll let you have a moment
- 13 | with your lawyer.
- MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 15 (Counsel and Defendant confers.)
- 16 MR. JENKINS: Your Honor, Mr. Palma Flores is
- 17 | prepared to address the Court.
- 18 THE COURT: All right. First, give me some sort of
- 19 | context.
- 20 MR. JENKINS: Your Honor, Mr. Palma Flores -- in
- 21 | fact, if --
- You can have a seat.
- I would just proffer, if I may, Your Honor, proffer
- 24 | this to the Court, that Mr. Palma Flores wanted the Court to
- 25 | understand and appreciate that it was not intentional on his

part to withhold the letter and his timing of when he chose to disclose it to his counsel. It was truly because he did not appreciate its significance. He certainly heard the Court's view on that and opinion of that. But he also would want the Court to know that in the last two years he's received many letters from Ms. Sheehy and others, and he simply forgot that he had some of these letters. And it was truly out of his concern in preparation for the presentation of his own testimony here today that he took the opportunity last night to go through all of his personal effects so he could refresh his recollection about certain events that had transpired over the last two years that have been testified in the court during the course of this trial.

And it is only through that that he then discovered the letter was in his possession and thought that it would be prudent to make his attorney aware of it.

THE COURT: All right. As long as your client is going to say just what you said, I don't think I need to specifically hear from him. I will make that statement or representation that you made a part of the record. I don't want to get into another constitutional situation by allowing him to address the Court without the benefit of the government having an opportunity to confront him on that. So there are a lot of issues that we're spending a lot of constitutional implications of that, but unless he's going to say something

- significantly different from what you proffered to the Court,

  I choose not to hear from him.
- 3 MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Your Honor. If I could 4 just confer.
- 5 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- 6 (Counsel and Defendant confers.)
  - MR. JENKINS: Then the only last piece of item to address prior to the jury being brought in, Mr. Palma Flores has advised me that while he understands his right to testify pursuant to the Fifth Amendment, that he is going to waive that right and not testify here today. He would simply ask that the Court mark one exhibit, which the government does not object to being marked as a defense exhibit and its admission. And that will be a photograph, that is, of Mr. Kollin Worlds in the possession of a handgun. We believe that it is a part of the Government's Exhibit 48A, but out of an abundance of caution we would ask that this photograph be marked and admitted into evidence.
- 19 THE COURT: Without objection?
- MR. BEN'ARY: Without objection, Your Honor.
- 21 THE COURT: All right. 48A. Let's do it this way.
- 22 | Is it a defense exhibit or a government exhibit?
- 23 MR. BEN'ARY: So this exhibit is marked Defendant's
- 24 | Exhibit 1. It's part -- we believe, Mr. Jenkins has
- 25 | represented that it's part of Mr. Worlds's Snapchat account,

- 1 which is in evidence as 48A, but it would be helpful, I mean,
- 2 | it's got thousands --
- 3 THE COURT: Let's mark it -- I think the best way to
- 4 | do it is to mark it as Defense Exhibit No. 1.
- 5 | Without objection?
- 6 MR. BEN'ARY: Without objection.
- 7 | (Defendant's Exhibit No. 1 admitted into evidence.)
- 8 THE COURT: Let's do this one as 1 and that one as
- 9 2. The first one is the letter that I've denied is 1, so that
- 10 | will be 2.
- 11 MR. JENKINS: Your Honor, I apologize on behalf of
- 12 Mr. Palma Flores, and I ask the Court just to be mindful of
- 13 his age and his inexperience with these types of matters, but
- 14 he has appealed upon me to request if the Court would afford
- 15 him a ten-minute recess so that he could confer with counsel
- 16 | so that he could be absolutely certain about his waiver of his
- 17 | right to testify.
- 18 THE COURT: I don't have any problem with that at
- 19 | all. We'll go ahead and accommodate that. Let me ask this.
- 20 | There are no people in here. If we were to go into recess,
- 21 | where would Mr. Palma Flores go?
- THE MARSHAL: We can keep him in here.
- 23 THE COURT: I'm going to go ahead and clear the
- 24 | courtroom.
- 25 Let Mr. Jenkins hear what I'm going to do.

1 I'm going to go ahead and clear the courtroom. I'11 2 let you have an opportunity, Mr. Jenkins, to confer with 3 Mr. Palma Flores, and then we're going to come back here at 10:45. 4 5 So ladies and gentlemen, there is some information and circumstances that dictate that I clear the courtroom at 6 7 this time, so that Mr. Jenkins can have an opportunity to confer with his client. We will be back in session at 10:45. 8 If you could please step out. Thank you. 10 THE BAILIFF: All rise. This court stands adjourned until 10:45. 11 12 (Recess.) (Court proceedings resumed at 10:49 a.m.) 13 14 THE COURT: We're back on the record of United States of America versus Melvin Palma Flores. 15 16 Mr. Jenkins, have you had an opportunity to counsel with your client? 17 18 MR. JENKINS: I have, Your Honor. And Mr. Palma 19 Flores wishes to exercise his Fifth Amendment right to 20 testify. 21 THE COURT: Yes, sir. That's entirely his right. Mr. Palma Flores, I'm going to ask you a few 22 23 questions with regard to your decision. I know the answers to 24 many of these questions. Did you have an opportunity to

discuss with Mr. Jenkins your decision to testify or not

testify in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And after discussions with Mr. Jenkins, did he provide you the circumstances in outlining the implications of your decision to testify including the ability of the government to cross-examine you? Has he discussed that with you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you have any questions that you asked Mr. Jenkins that he was unable to answer with regard to you exercising your Fifth Amendment right to testify?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry, Your Honor, but, you know, I really thought I was going to have more time, you know. So I don't think I had enough time to prepare for this.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Palma Flores, as your counsel has previously indicated, this case has been pending for, I believe, over a year or two. And I know that Mr. Jenkins is a very well-respected officer of the Court and has taken the time that he needs to take with you to make sure that you were both prepared for trial today and knew the implications of all the circumstances associated with any decision that you made during the course of this trial.

I'll ask you one final question, sir. Is it your voluntary decision -- in other words, is anyone forcing you to testify today?

25 1 THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: All right, Sir. Do you have any 3 additional questions that you want to ask the Court related to your decision to testify? 4 5 THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor. Is the government satisfied with the 6 THE COURT: 7 colloquy that the Court exercised with Mr. Flores? 8 MR. BEN'ARY: Oh, yes, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Mr. Jenkins, are you, sir? 10 MR. JENKINS: I am, Your Honor. 11 (Counsel and Defendant confers.) 12 THE COURT: All right. Counsel, there's a few little cleanup things that we need to do with the instructions 13 14 prior to Mr. Palma Flores taking the stand. 15 I'm going to deal with the easy one first. During 16 the course of a trial, I may ask a question of a witness. 17 don't think that that has any application unless something 18 happens unusual with regard to Mr. Palma Flores. 19 Do we agree that that one can be removed? 20 MR. BEN'ARY: Yes. 21 MR. JENKINS: Agreed, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: All right. And then there's Y, 23 credibility to immunize witnesses. What we have done with 24 that is insert the names Elijah Kyle-Canady and Kollin Worlds

-Tonia M. Harris OCR-USDC/EDVA 703-646-1438-

into "the name of individuals."

1 Satisfied with that?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very good. The next one is FF. I believe it's -- affect the defendant's decision not to testify since Mr. Palma Flores is exercising his right, that would not be appropriate to give at this point.

Do we agree?

MR. BEN'ARY: Agreed.

MR. JENKINS: Agreed, Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: All right. That will be removed. And

finally, was there some sort of resolution on ZZ?

MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor.

offered for malice and premeditation.

MR. BEN'ARY: So we, I think, had e-mailed it this morning, Your Honor. We are in agreement that it actually becomes two instructions, ZZ-1 and ZZ-2. It provides the elements of 924(j) and then a definition of murder. And then it is read in connection with the definitions previously

THE COURT: All right. Marlon, this morning I was made aware of that, and I directed that it be inserted and reinserted at the proper place.

MR. BEN'ARY: And not to add to the workload, but it looks like in the last line of ZZ-2, it should read "presence or absence of premeditation" instead of "presence or absence or premeditation."

THE COURT: Counsel, I'm going to use my black 1 2 pen -- or actually it's a blue pen and just make the R an F. 3 Does anyone have any problem with that? 4 MR. JENKINS: No objection. 5 MR. BEN'ARY: No objection. 6 THE COURT: Very good. All right. My suggestion is 7 this, when we come back in, since Mr. Melvin Palma Flores has 8 exercised his right to testify --9 Mr. Jenkins, I think the first thing that, maybe, you want to do -- you can do it another way if you choose 10 11 to -- is offer Defendant's Exhibit No. 2, which has been 12 admitted. 13 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: That way the jury will be aware that 14 15 that has become part of the court record. 16 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: And, Trish, make sure -- make sure that that No. 1 does not go back. You can put it in a separate 18 19 folder, I don't care, but just make sure it's not with the rest of the stuff. 20 21 All right. We ready to bring the jury back in? 22 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. 23 MR. BEN'ARY: One just very brief housekeeping 24 matter, Your Honor. Yesterday the Court made a note that it

was the Court's observation that Hector Flores came back into

- 1 | the courtroom. And I don't think that it will have any legal
- 2 | significance, but I think that it actually was not Hector
- 3 Flores.
- 4 THE COURT: Someone that maybe looked like him?
- 5 MR. BEN'ARY: There's another individual -- it's
- 6 | difficult with the mask -- with a similar stature and
- 7 hairstyle.
- 8 THE COURT: But we all agree that Ms. Sheehy came
- 9 back in?
- MR. BEN'ARY: Yes, Your Honor.
- 11 THE COURT: Very good. Actually, it's easier to
- 12 | identify Ms. Sheehy, because she was the individual who came
- 13 | in without a mask on and I noticed that right over there to
- 14 the left.
- 15 Very good. Ms. Tinsley.
- 16 Ladies and gentlemen, as the jury comes back in, I'm
- 17 | going to ask that if you need to be in the courtroom, or want
- 18 to be in the courtroom, this is your time to be here. We're
- 19 | not going to be getting up and walking out during the course
- 20 of the litigation. So you need to stay in here until we take
- 21 a break.
- 22 (Jury present.)
- 23 THE COURT: All right. You may have a seat, ladies
- 24 | and gentlemen, in the gallery.
- 25 Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. It's okay to

	[ 29
1	speak back, there's no rule against that. Glad to have you
2	all back here today. We are heading into day three. Please
3	be assured that during the time that you were not brought into
4	the courtroom, we were in here working on things that you need
5	not concern yourself with. So it wasn't that, necessarily,
6	we're running late, but we had to take care of some matters
7	before we brought you back in. Have all of you been able to
8	live up to the Court's instruction not to discuss the case or
9	any aspect of the case with anyone?
10	Very good. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.
11	The prosecution has rested its case.
12	Now, Mr. Jenkins.
13	MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor,
14	may it please the Court, the defense would call Mr. Melvin
15	Palma Flores.
16	THE COURT: Come on up, sir.
17	(Defendant's witness, Melvin Palma Flores, was sworn.)
18	(Witness seated.)
19	THE COURT: You may take the stand, sir. As has
20	been the case throughout the proceeding, you have been
21	unmasked. You're free to testify without the mask on at this
22	point, sir.
23	MR. JENKINS: May counsel proceed, Your Honor?
24	THE COURT: You may.
25	MR. JENKINS: Thank you.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY MR. JENKINS:

- 3 Q. Good morning, Mr. Palma Flores.
- 4 A. Good morning.
- 5 Q. Do you prefer Mr. Palma Flores or Mr. Flores?
- 6 A. Palma Flores is fine.
- 7 Q. Mr. Palma Flores, how old are you?
- 8 A. 20 years old.
- 9 Q. Back in October of 2019, how old were you?
- 10 A. I just turned -- well, my birthday is in October --
- 11 October 17. So are we talking before the 17 or after the 17?
- 12 Q. After the 17th.
- 13 A. I just turned 18 years old.
- 14 Q. You just turned 18 years old?
- 15 A. That's correct.
- 16 Q. And where were you residing at that time?
- 17 A. Alexandria, Virginia.
- 18 Q. And what were you doing to earn a living during that
- 19 period of time?
- 20 A. I sold marijuana.
- 21 Q. Can you give us a sense of the scale of your sales of
- 22 | marijuana?
- 23 A. Probably like -- like, at one time or overall are we
- 24 talking?
- 25 Q. Typically, in an average week.

- 1 A. Rough estimate probably, like, 4 ounces, maybe.
- 2 Q. How much money were you earning on a weekly basis from
- 3 | selling marijuana?
- 4 A. On a good week, probably like \$3,000.
- 5 Q. Did you own any firearms?
- 6 A. At the beginning, I didn't. But once I seen, like, a lot
- 7 of my close friends were, like, getting, you know, robbed --
- 8 and sometimes it wasn't even just, like, you know, snatch and
- 9 grab, more so, like, at gunpoint, you know. I started to get
- 10 | scared. And I'm, like, you know, I think I'm going to need a
- 11 | firearm, but it's not like I always throughout the whole
- 12 | career of selling marijuana I used to carry a firearm.
- 13 Q. Okay. I'm going to need you to keep your voice up, okay?
- 14 A. Okay.
- 15 Q. I want to take you back to October the 25th, 2019. Do
- 16 | you recall the events of that day?
- 17 A. Yes. Yes, I do.
- 18 Q. Earlier in the day, where were you?
- 19 A. I was at my house, which is my mother's house.
- 20 Q. Did there come a time in which someone contacted you
- 21 | about purchasing marijuana?
- 22 | A. Um, yes. Owa texted me and said he had a friend that
- 23 | wanted to buy some marijuana, if I was going to be able to
- 24 give him some.
- 25 Q. The "Qwa" that you just referred to, is that Mr. Brown?

- 1 A. That's correct.
- 2 Q. The decedent in this case?
- 3 A. That's correct.
- 4 Q. How long had you known Qwa Brown?
- 5 A. Probably, the first time we met, I was probably about 14
- 6 or 15. I can't remember exactly.
- 7 Q. So at that point in time, is it safe to say you knew him
- 8 about four or five years?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Okay. And what was the nature of your relationship with
- 11 Mr. Brown?
- 12 A. I mean, he would buy marijuana from me. Sometimes we
- 13 | would smoke together, you know. Just, you know, good friends.
- 14 | O. You considered him a friend?
- 15 A. Correct.
- 16 Q. After you got this call from him on October 25th, what
- 17 | happened?
- 18 A. He said a friend of his was going to come and get some
- 19 | marijuana if I was willing to give him the marijuana. I said
- 20 | "yes" as long as he actually knows him and that's a friend of
- 21 his. He said, "Yeah, that's a friend of mine." I said,
- 22 "Okay."
- 23 Q. Where was the exchange to take place?
- 24 A. At my house.
- 25 | Q. Did there come a time in which someone arrived at your

- 1 | house after having this conversation with Mr. Brown?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Okay. Who arrived at your house?
- 4 A. I knew the other person as Charles, I don't know his last
- 5 | name or nothing like that. But the second individual was
- 6 | Elijah, the person that testified on the first day of my
- 7 trial.
- 8 Q. And the two of them showed up at your house?
- 9 A. Correct.
- 10 | Q. Did you see how they arrived at your house?
- 11 A. Um, they -- it was like -- I don't know -- I don't know
- 12 | how to explain it, but it's just once I seen them coming into
- 13 | my backyard -- I was in my living room. I was playing video
- 14 games with my friend, and then I seen two people, like, walk
- 15 | into my front yard, going towards the back, and I'm like "What
- 16 | the hell is that?" You know. And then, once I go to the
- 17 | backyard, I see there's two individuals. I'm like, "Can I
- 18 | help you guys?" And I think that's when Charles was like,
- 19 "Yeah, I'm here for the marijuana."
- 20 Q. And did you sell Charles a quantity of marijuana?
- 21 A. I was supposed to, but once I brought it out, he just,
- 22 | you know -- he seen it, he's like, "Okay. This is the ounce?"
- 23 | I was like, "Yeah." And then he just ran with it.
- 24 Q. It was an ounce of marijuana?
- 25 A. Correct.

- 1 Q. What was the amount that you intended to sell that ounce
- 2 of marijuana to Charles for, if you recall?
- 3 | A. It's been two years, so maybe like 300 to \$600, I can't
- 4 | really remember what was the exact price.
- 5 Q. But at some point in time, it's your testimony that
- 6 | Charles grabbed the marijuana?
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 Q. What did he do?
- 9 A. He just ran off with it.
- 10 Q. When Charles grabbed the marijuana and ran off, what did
- 11 | the second individual, Elijah, do?
- 12 A. He just stood there, you know, kind of, like mean-mugging
- 13 | me. You know, I was starting to get a little...
- 14 Q. Did you know Elijah?
- 15 A. Before that, never seen him.
- 16 Q. Did you know Charles before that?
- 17 A. Before that, never seen him.
- 18 Q. Now, when Elijah is standing looking at you and Charles
- 19 is running away, what, if anything, did you do?
- 20 | A. Well, he just didn't stand there. He started approaching
- 21 | me. And I was, like, "Why is this guy approaching me?" So I
- 22 | started to get scared. And then I had a gun in my waistband,
- 23 | so I brandished the firearm. And once he seen that, he
- 24 | started walking away, too. Once he started walking away, I
- 25 | just put the gun back in my waistband and I went inside.

- 1 Q. Do you remember what type of gun you had that day?
- 2 A. I'm not really -- I'm not too familiar with guns, but I
- 3 | know it was, like, a .45-caliber, but I don't know the brand,
- 4 | the name, the model, or anything like that.
- 5 Q. And once you placed the firearm back in your waistband,
- 6 | what did Elijah do?
- 7 A. Like I said, he walked off.
- 8 Q. After this incident, did you speak with Qwa Brown?
- 9 A. Yeah. I called him and I was like, "Hey, you know,
- 10 | the" -- "your friend that you sent me, you know, he" -- "he
- 11 | took the marijuana without paying for it." And then, you
- 12 know, he was like, "Oh, that's messed up." You know, he
- 13 | started telling me that he was going to look into it and stuff
- 14 | like that.
- 15 Q. Keep your voice up, Mr. --
- 16 A. He said -- he said -- I called him. I'm like, "Hey, your
- 17 | friend that you sent me, " you know -- we say "run off."
- 18 | That's when -- or "snatch and grab," you know, taking the
- 19 | marijuana without paying for it. And I was explaining to him
- 20 | what happened and he was like, "Oh, that's messed up. I
- 21 | didn't know nothing about it," and he was going to look into
- 22 | it. And that was the last of the conversation.
- 23 Q. Do you know an individual by the name of Kollin Worlds?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. And Kollin Worlds testified on yesterday here before this

- 1 jury?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. How long had you known Kollin Worlds prior to the events
- 4 of October 25, 2019?
- 5 A. (Laughing). We -- we went to the same elementary school.
- 6 | So if I'm not mistaken, we met each other, I want to say,
- 7 | probably third or fourth grade. I can't remember. I think,
- 8 | if I'm not mistaken, third grade.
- 9 MR. JENKINS: Court's indulgence. Your Honor, if I
- 10 can publish to the jury at this time what has previously been
- 11 | admitted as defense Exhibit 2.
- 12 THE COURT: Yes, sir.
- 13 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 14 Q. Mr. Palma Flores, can you take a look at the screen? Is
- 15 | that the individual that you've testified to, your former
- 16 | friend Kollin Worlds?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 | O. And that's the same individual who testified on
- 19 yesterday?
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 Q. Had you seen this photograph before?
- 22 A. Um, besides the time he sent it to me, no.
- 23 Q. Tell us about that. When did you first see this
- 24 | photograph?
- 25 A. It was after, you know, the --

- 1 Q. Was it after Mr. Brown was killed?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. In this photograph, what is Mr. Worlds holding in his
- 4 hand?
- 5 A. It looks, like, obviously a gun.
- 6 Q. Did you understand it to be a gun when you received it --
- 7 | when you received this photograph?
- 8 A. Yes. Because, um, it has -- it has a laser beam on it,
- 9 | so usually that's on, you know, guns.
- 10 Q. Had you -- how did you receive this photograph?
- 11 A. He sent it to me through Snapchat.
- 12 Q. Had you communicated with Kollin Worlds through Snapchat
- 13 | before?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Are you familiar with his Snapchat account?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. Do you see the image that is above Mr. Worlds's head?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Do you recognize that?
- 20 A. Yeah. That's -- it's called a -- if I'm not mistaken,
- 21 | your bit emoji [sic] is like a -- you can make a -- you could
- 22 | say a resemblance to you, and then every time it just pops up
- 23 as your Snapchat account.
- 24 | Q. Did you -- when you received this photograph, did you
- 25 | recognize that bit emoji as being associated with Kollin

- 1 Worlds?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Now, Mr. Palma Flores, beyond being your friend, back in
- 4 October of 2019, did you and Mr. World [sic] have any business
- 5 dealings together?
- 6 A. As far as "business," you mean the marijuana, or just
- 7 | business dealings in general?
- 8 Q. Marijuana, business dealings, you describe it.
- 9 A. Yeah. You know, sometimes he would borrow clothes from
- 10 me. Or if there was some shoes that he liked that I had, I
- 11 | would sell them to him. Obviously, you know, I would buy
- 12 marijuana from him. Sometimes, you know, I would let him
- 13 | borrow marijuana. You know, just back-and-forth relationship.
- 14 Q. Was there ever an occasion in which you sold marijuana
- 15 | for him?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. The marijuana that was taken from you on October the
- 18 | 25th, 2019, by Charles, who did that marijuana belong to?
- 19 A. Kollin.
- 20 Q. What was -- were you selling it on behalf of Kollin?
- 21 A. It's something that's called "fronting." Another word
- 22 | for it is "consignment." You know, so let's say -- he would
- 23 | be like, "Hey, I'll front you this X amount of marijuana, this
- 24 | type of marijuana. You know, you don't got to pay me right
- 25 | now, just sell it for me and then give me this back" -- "this

- 1 amount of money back and you can keep the rest."
- 2 Q. And after Charles took the marijuana from you, did you
- 3 | speak with Kollin about what had occurred?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. How did Kollin respond?
- 6 A. He was, basically, trying to find out who took the
- 7 | marijuana, but since I had never seen those two individuals
- 8 before, it was hard to explain to him.
- 9 Q. Well, did you share with him how you came to be
- 10 | introduced to these two individuals?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Did Kollin know that it was Mr. Brown who had made the
- 13 | introduction?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And how did he respond to hearing that?
- 16 A. He got mad because he has another friend named Jude, and
- 17 | I guess he was -- came to the assumption that, I guess, Qwa
- 18 | robbed Jude, too. I don't know exactly when, but it was
- 19 before I got robbed.
- 20 Q. Mr. Palma Flores, let me stop you there. Do you recall
- 21 his testimony about Jude being robbed?
- 22 A. I don't remember.
- 23 Q. Well, tell us what you understood about Jude being
- 24 robbed?
- 25 A. Basically, he was supposed to sell -- I don't know how

- 1 | many ounces to Qwa, but I know he was supposed to sell a
- 2 | couple of ounces to Qwa, and Qwa again did a snatch and grab.
- 3 Q. After this occurred, what did you do next that day?
- 4 A. Which day?
- 5 Q. On October 25th?
- 6 A. I was with one of my friends -- Jason was at the house
- 7 | with me, you know. I go drop him off at Edison and then I go
- 8 | call Kollin and just explained everything that happened, and
- 9 he was like "Okay."
- 10 | Q. At this point, what are you using for transportation?
- 11 A. My mother's van.
- 12 Q. Do you know an individual by the name of Laila Sheehy?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. How do you know her?
- 15 A. Um, I was somewhat intimate with her.
- 16 Q. You were involved in a relationship with her?
- 17 A. We started off as friends, and then, you know, after a
- 18 | while we became, you know, boyfriend and girlfriend.
- 19 Q. Do you have a child in common?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. How old is your child?
- 22 A. He just turned one in September -- on September 28th.
- 23 Q. On October 25, 2019, did you see Ms. Sheehy?
- 24 A. I don't think I seen her, because if I'm not mistaken --
- 25 | and I'm sorry, this was two years ago, so I'm trying to

- 1 remember.
- 2 Q. The day in which you were robbed.
- 3 A. I didn't see her that day. I seen her later on that
- 4 | night.
- 5 Q. So you interpreted my question as being the daylight
- 6 hours. I'm talking about the entire day of October 25th, day
- 7 | and night, did there come a time in which you saw Ms. Sheehy?
- 8 A. I think so.
- 9 Q. Around what time of day was it?
- 10 A. I know it was at nighttime. That's why I'm saying I
- 11 | don't know if it was on the October 25th night leading into
- 12 October 26th morning, but I know I definitely seen her October
- 13 26th.
- 14 Q. What was the occasion for you to see her, how did it
- 15 | happen?
- 16 A. Um, I just wanted to talk to her because, you know, we
- 17 | were going through some things, and I just felt like I wanted
- 18 to vent about the situation.
- 19 Q. Where did you meet her?
- 20 A. In Kingstowne area.
- 21 Q. Is Kingstowne, Alexandria portion?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Did you and -- did you meet her at a residence or a
- 24 | commercial place? Where did you meet her?
- 25 | A. I met her at -- I think by her -- it was by her friend's

- 1 house, but not exactly at her friend's house.
- 2 Q. How were you communicating with her before you actually
- 3 | met with her?
- 4 A. That's the thing. We stopped talking for a little bit.
- 5 Like, the -- our relationship is sometimes -- you know, when
- 6 | we're on good terms, we're on good terms. We're talking --
- 7 MR. BEN'ARY: I'm going to object. This is not
- 8 responsive to the question.
- 9 MR. JENKINS: Well, what I want to know -- I'll
- 10 rephrase, Your Honor.
- 11 THE COURT: Thank you.
- 12 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 13 Q. Did you speak with her by text message or telephone? How
- 14 | did you get in contact with her in order to arrange the
- 15 | meeting?
- 16 A. I think I probably called her.
- 17 Q. Once you and Ms. Sheehy were together, was there anyone
- 18 | else there?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Who?
- 21 A. Kollin.
- 22 | Q. What, if anything, did you, Ms. Sheehy, and Kollin do
- 23 once you got together?
- 24 | A. You know, we were -- Kollin was supposed to re-up, which
- 25 | means buy more marijuana, and then I was supposed to -- he was

- 1 | supposed to give me a little bit more since I didn't have any
- 2 more marijuana.
- 3 | Q. Did you know -- did you know who Kollin's source of
- 4 | supply for marijuana was at that time?
- 5 A. No. Because then that would be pointless. Then I
- 6 | wouldn't have to go through him, I could just go straight to
- 7 | the source. So people usually don't let you know who their
- 8 | marijuana supplier is.
- 9 Q. At that point in time, on October 25, 2019, did you know
- 10 | where Mr. Brown lived?
- 11 A. No. I never been to his house. Every time we had
- 12 dealings, he would come to my house or my neighborhood.
- 13 Q. Did there come a time in which you, Kollin, and
- 14 Ms. Sheehy left the Kingstowne area?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And where did you go?
- 17 A. To the Richmond Highway area.
- 18 Q. For what purpose?
- 19 A. To get more marijuana.
- 20 Q. Whose home were you going to get the marijuana from?
- 21 A. I don't know.
- 22 Q. Where did you go in the Kingstowne area, do you remember
- 23 exactly?
- 24 | A. It was -- it was across the street from the elementary
- 25 | school. I think -- the neighborhood is called --

- 1 Q. Let me have you take a look at --
- 2 MR. JENKINS: If I could have it pulled up,
- 3 | Government's Exhibit 13. This has previously been admitted
- 4 into evidence.
- 5 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 6 Q. Mr. Palma Flores, do you remember the testimony on
- 7 | yesterday and Monday about this exhibit?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Okay. Is this the location you just described for the
- 10 | jury as to where you, Ms. Sheehy, and Mr. Kollin Worlds had
- 11 | traveled to?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. How did you arrive at this location -- I mean, which --
- 14 | what vehicle?
- 15 A. We were in Laila's car.
- 16 Q. Who was driving Laila's car?
- 17 A. Laila.
- 18 Q. Where were you seated in the vehicle?
- 19 A. In the passenger seat.
- 20 Q. In the front or in the back?
- 21 A. In the front.
- 22 | Q. Where was Mr. Worlds seated?
- 23 A. In the backseat.
- 24 | Q. I believe you testified that you came to this location
- 25 | with the understanding that Mr. World was going to re-up,

- 1 | correct?
- 2 A. Yes, sir.
- 3 Q. And that is get more marijuana from his supplier,
- 4 | correct?
- 5 A. That's correct, sir.
- 6 Q. What happened when you arrived at this location?
- 7 A. We basically just -- he was leading us because, you know,
- 8 | I never been there before; but he told us to wait here, he was
- 9 going to go get more marijuana. He should be back, like,
- 10 | five, ten, -- five, ten minutes tops.
- 11 | Q. When you were in their car, at this point in time, did
- 12 | you have your cell phone with you?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. Where was your cell phone?
- 15 A. With Kollin.
- 16 Q. Did Kollin ask to use your phone?
- 17 A. Yeah. Because he doesn't have a phone.
- 18 Q. What was your understanding as to why Kollin wanted to
- 19 | use your phone?
- 20 A. That way he would be able to know when the marijuana
- 21 | dealer is outside.
- 22 Q. And did you permit Kollin to use your phone?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. Did there come a time in which Kollin exited the vehicle?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. Where did he go?
- 2 A. It was really dark that night, so he went to -- I was,
- 3 | obviously -- I'm in the passenger seat, so that's the
- 4 | right-hand side of the car. He got out through the right-hand
- 5 | side of the car and went towards my right-hand side.
- 6 Q. What, if anything, do you recall happening after he got
- 7 | out of the car?
- 8 A. We were waiting like 10, 15 minutes and then some shots
- 9 rang out.
- 10 Q. Prior to that, I think you heard the testimony of
- 11 Mr. Worlds, that he indicated that you were using your phone
- 12 to communicate with Mr. Brown through Mr. Kollin Worlds's
- 13 | Snapchat, do you remember that testimony?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Was that true?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 | Q. Did you ever log in on your phone with Mr. Kollin
- 18 | Worlds's Snapchat? Did you ever log in to his account on your
- 19 | phone?
- 20 A. No. I didn't know his password.
- 21 Q. After you heard the gunshots, what happened next?
- 22 | A. Um, I got scared, because that was the first time I ever
- 23 | heard gunshots, but I'm just looking at Laila like, "What the
- 24 | fuck?" And a couple minutes later, Kollin is running up to
- 25 | the car.

- 1 Q. You said that was the first time you heard gunshots. Is
- 2 | that outside of a gun range?
- 3 MR. BEN'ARY: I'm going to object to the leading
- 4 | nature of that question.
- 5 THE COURT: It was.
- 6 Rephrase, Mr. Jenkins.
- 7 MR. JENKINS: I'll rephrase.
- 8 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 9 Q. Is it true that that's the first time you ever heard a
- 10 | qunshot?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. And after -- after he -- did he come back to the car?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. What happened next?
- 15 A. He told us to "Go, go, go, go."
- 16 Q. Where did you go?
- 17 A. We just went straight down, like, this straight road
- 18 | ahead and then we made a left hand.
- 19 Q. Without you telling us what he said, did he say anything
- 20 | to you about what had happened?
- 21 THE COURT: Yes or no?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 24 Q. When you left this area, where did you go to? Where is
- 25 | the next place you went to?

- 1 A. We went back to -- so when I went to go pick up Laila, I
- 2 | left my mom's car in that neighborhood, so we went back to the
- 3 | Kingstowne area and I got in my mother's van, and then Laila
- 4 had to go home.
- 5 Q. Do you know someone by the name of Hector Flores?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. How do you know Hector Flores?
- 8 A. He's my cousin.
- 9 Q. Did you see him on this evening?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. Could you please describe for the jury the circumstances
- 12 under which you saw your cousin, Hector Flores, on this
- 13 | evening?
- 14 A. I had to go back to Arlington because my mother works the
- 15 | graveyard shift, so I was en route to go pick her up, but
- 16 | Kollin wanted me to burn his clothes.
- 17 | Q. Did you know why Kollin wanted you to burn his clothes?
- 18 A. At first, no. But then I got to thinking, okay, I just
- 19 heard gunshots, you know. He came back to the car talking
- 20 | about "go, go, go," now he's asking me to burn his clothes;
- 21 | and I was like either he got in a shoot-out or something
- 22 happened.
- 23 Q. Did you agree to burn his clothes?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Why?

- 1 A. You know, that was my friend. Like, there's nothing --
- 2 Q. Where did you go to burn his clothes?
- 3 A. To my cousin Hector.
- 4 Q. How did you contact Hector?
- 5 A. I called him.
- 6 Q. And what, if anything, did you say to Hector?
- 7 A. I said, um, "Can you come outside with a lighter?"
- 8 Q. Did he come outside with the lighter?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. And what did you do?
- 11 A. I burned Kollin's clothes.
- 12 Q. Where was Kollin when you were burning his clothes?
- 13 A. In my mother's van.
- 14 Q. After you finished burning the clothing -- did you talk
- 15 | to Hector that night about what had happened?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 | Q. After you completed burning Kollin's clothes, what did
- 18 you do?
- 19 A. I went back to the van, and I went to go pick up my
- 20 mother.
- 21 | Q. Was Kollin with you when you went to pick up your mother?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Did you actually go pick up your mother?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. And what did you do next?

- 1 A. We picked my mother up and then my mother -- she said she
- 2 | was hungry, so she took us to IHOP.
- 3 Q. Okay. And when you say "us," is that you and Kollin?
- 4 A. That's correct.
- 5 | Q. At some point in time, did you separate from Kollin?
- 6 A. No. We were -- well, he came to us -- he came with us to
- 7 | eat at IHOP, and after IHOP we went back to my house and he
- 8 | slept over. And then we went to my friend Jason's house the
- 9 next morning and that's when he left.
- 10 Q. At that point in time, did you know that Mr. Brown had
- 11 | been shot and killed?
- 12 A. While he was sleeping over, no.
- 13 Q. When is it that you first learned -- did there come a
- 14 | time in which you learned that Mr. Brown had been shot and
- 15 | killed?
- 16 A. When -- I'm going through social media and they're
- 17 | saying, "Rest in peace, Qwa." And I was like that's -- that's
- 18 | weird, like, I was just talking to him.
- 19 Q. How -- well, when was that? How soon was -- how close in
- 20 | time was that to when you had had this situation where you
- 21 | heard the gunshots? Was it the same day, was it the next day,
- 22 | when was it?
- 23 A. It was the -- it was a couple hours after that. So it
- 24 | was the same day on the 26th.
- 25 | Q. Now, at some point in time, were you contacted by

- 1 | Detective Wallace?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And when were you contacted by Detective Wallace?
- 4 A. I can't remember off the top of my head, but --
- 5 Q. Was it near in time when the shooting had occurred?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 | Q. Did you agree to meet with Detective Wallace?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Did you agree to speak with her?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. Did she explain to you that you had a right not to speak
- 12 | with her?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 | Q. Did she ask you about your whereabouts the night that
- 15 Mr. Brown was shot?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. What, if anything, did you tell her?
- 18 A. I told her I was home with my sister.
- 19 Q. Was that true?
- 20 A. No.
- 21 Q. Why did you lie?
- 22 A. Um, I'm afraid of the police.
- 23 Q. Mr. Palma Flores, after speaking with Detective
- 24 | Wallace -- at this point in time, when you spoke with
- 25 | Detective Wallace, were you and Ms. Sheehy in a good place in

- 1 | your relationship or a bad place?
- 2 | A. I would say somewhere in the middle. It wasn't good nor
- 3 | bad; we was trying to repair our relationship.
- 4 Q. I want to take you now to December of 2019. You've heard
- 5 | some testimony from Ms. Sheehy that there was a domestic
- 6 incident between the two of you; do you remember that
- 7 testimony?
- 8 A. Correct.
- 9 Q. Do you remember the events leading up to that?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. Can you tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury what
- 12 | happened in December of 2019 between you and Ms. Sheehy?
- 13 A. So I wake up -- I was sleeping and then I wake up out of
- 14 | nowhere because my phone is constantly ringing. And I look at
- 15 | it and it's Laila. I pick up the phone, I'm like "Hello" and
- 16 | she's like "Hey." She was working at Motel 6. She like, "I'm
- 17 | about to have a lunch break. I'm about to come over because I
- 18 | need to talk to you." And the -- the tone in her voice, she
- 19 | sounded like -- like it was up to no good. It was a storm
- 20 brewing, like.
- 21 Q. She was to come over to your house?
- 22 A. Correct.
- 23 Q. To your mother's house?
- 24 A. Correct.
- 25 Q. Did she come over to your mother's house?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Did you -- well, what happened when she got over?
- 3 A. She said, "Let me see your phone. Let me see your
- 4 | phone." I was like, "For what?" She like, "Oh, I know
- 5 | you" -- "you're talking to that bitch again."
- 6 Q. She was accusing you of being unfaithful?
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 Q. Is this the first time she had ever accused you of being
- 9 | unfaithful?
- 10 A. No.
- 11 | Q. What happened?
- 12 A. I gave her the phone. She starts going through the
- 13 | phone, Instagram, Snapchat, my text messages, my call logs,
- 14 just, you know, searching stuff up. And I'm like, "What are
- 15 | you talking about? I just woke up." She's like, "No. You
- 16 | trying to play me like I'm crazy. She just told me you were
- 17 | talking to her." I'm like, "Who are you talking about? I
- 18 | just woke up." And you're like, "Oh, you always want to play
- 19 | stupid. Don't" -- "don't act dumb now." I'm like, "I'm not
- 20 | acting dumb. What are you talking about?"
- 21 Q. At this point in time, Mr. Palma Flores, between October
- 22 and December of 2019, had you and Ms. Sheehy discussed the
- 23 | events surrounding the shooting of Mr. Brown?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. On this day in which you're having this argument about

- 1 cheating?
- 2 | A. No. Prior to that, it was -- Kollin wanted us to meet up
- 3 | with him. So we --
- 4 MR. BEN'ARY: Anything that Kollin said.
- 5 MR. JENKINS: Your Honor, I don't think he said
- 6 | that. He just said they met up.
- 7 MR. BEN'ARY: No, I think he said -- was saying what
- 8 Kollin said.
- 9 THE COURT: Just focus him.
- 10 MR. JENKINS: Yeah.
- 11 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 12 Q. Well, don't tell us what Kollin said. But did you meet
- 13 | up with Kollin?
- 14 A. I said Kollin wanted to meet up.
- 15 Q. Okay. Meet up with who?
- 16 A. Me and Laila.
- 17 | Q. And afterwards -- well, was this before or after the
- 18 December 2019 incident between you and Ms. Sheehy?
- 19 A. That was a couple days before, if I'm not mistaken. We
- 20 | went to his cousin's apartment out in D.C.
- 21 | Q. Was this before or after you had received a photograph by
- 22 | Snapchat that you identified as Defense Exhibit 2?
- 23 A. That was before.
- 24 | Q. It was before you had received that photograph?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. Taking you back to the argument with Ms. Sheehy, she
- 2 | testified that at some point in time you looked through her
- 3 | phone; was that true?
- 4 A. No. I feel like usually it's the woman that's supposed
- 5 to go through the man's phone. I don't go through women's
- 6 phone.
- 7 Q. Did -- she also testified that during that argument you
- 8 | talked about her attempting to get in contact with law
- 9 enforcement; do you remember that testimony?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Was that true?
- 12 A. That was not true. We were just having an argument as
- 13 far as my infidelity.
- 14 Q. Now, after that incident, did there come a time in which
- 15 | you were arrested for domestic violence?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. And did you and Ms. Sheehy talk about your arrest?
- 18 A. Um, yeah.
- 19 Q. Now, I want to fast forward a little bit. Your cousin,
- 20 | Hector Flores, you recall his testimony on yesterday, correct?
- 21 A. Correct.
- 22 | Q. And Mr. Flores testified that at some point in time, a
- 23 | couple months after the shooting, that he had a conversation
- 24 | with you in which you told him you killed somebody?
- 25 A. That never happened.

- 1 Q. Did you ever tell anyone that you killed Mr. Brown?
- 2 A. No.
- 3 Q. Now, Mr. Palma Flores, when you were -- after your arrest
- 4 | in this case, did you have occasion to communicate with
- 5 Ms. Sheehy?
- 6 A. Correct.
- 7 Q. How did you communicate with her?
- 8 A. The phone, mail, that's pretty much it.
- 9 Q. Mail was one of the ways in which you communicated with
- 10 her?
- 11 A. Correct.
- MR. JENKINS: If I can have published to the jury at
- 13 | this time Government's Exhibit 35.
- 14 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 15 | Q. Can you tell us what's on the screen now, Mr. Palma
- 16 | Flores? Is it one of your letters to Ms. Sheehy?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 Q. Now, in this letter, Mr. Palma Flores, you mentioned --
- 19 | make reference to Ms. Sheehy cheating on you with Summer's
- 20 brother?
- 21 A. That's correct.
- 22 Q. And you remember Ms. Sheehy testifying about that?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. And testifying that Summer's brother was a reference to a
- 25 | family member of hers who was in law enforcement?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Was that true?
- 3 A. No.
- 4 Q. Tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury, what did you
- 5 | mean by that in this letter?
- 6 A. She has a friend named Summer and she cheated on me with
- 7 her brother.
- 8 Q. Did this have anything to do with law enforcement?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. Did this have anything to do with Mr. Brown's shooting
- 11 | and killing?
- 12 A. No.
- 13 Q. I'm going to now turn your attention to Government's
- 14 Exhibit No. 34.
- Now, before I -- before we talk about this exhibit,
- 16 | you said you -- after your arrest you communicated with
- 17 Ms. Sheehy by mail. Is that from the jail?
- 18 A. Correct.
- 19 Q. Okay. And do I take it, normally, you would just mail it
- 20 | out from the jail?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Let me take -- draw your attention now to Government's
- 23 Exhibit 34. What is this?
- 24 A. This is a letter I wrote to Laila.
- 25 | Q. And did you send this letter out through the normal means

- 1 | as you testified you sent out Government's Exhibit 35?
- 2 A. No.
- 3 Q. Tell us about the circumstances on how you sent this
- 4 letter out.
- 5 A. It was a person in the jail that was getting released
- 6 | soon, so I started writing a letter to her so he could give
- 7 to -- if not a friend or give it directly to her.
- 8 Q. Why didn't you just put it in the normal mail?
- 9 A. Because they -- people at the ADC review the mail.
- 10 Q. Was there something contained in this letter you didn't
- 11 | want the sheriffs at the jail to read -- to have access to?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Why?
- 14 A. Because I didn't trust my lawyer at the time. He was
- 15 | railroading me and, you know, we were just -- weren't seeing
- 16 | eye to eye. I was trying to -- you know, just reach out to
- 17 | her and tell her, like, the stuff that she's doing is messed
- 18 up.
- 19 Q. At that point in time I didn't represent you, correct?
- 20 A. No, sir.
- 21 Q. But is it fair to say you were dissatisfied with your
- 22 | counsel at that time?
- 23 A. That's correct.
- 24 | Q. Now, I want to go to the contents of the letter. Do you
- 25 | have it before you?

- 1 MR. JENKINS: If you can blow up the first five
- 2 | lines of it.
- 3 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 4 Q. Now, Mr. Palma Flores, can you read the portion that's on
- 5 | the screen?
- 6 A. It says, "Hey babe, in this letter I'm going to tell you
- 7 | everything I can't on the phone."
- 8 Q. Stop there. Stop there. What do you mean by that?
- 9 A. You know, just like the mail is monitored, the jail phone
- 10 | calls are monitored as well.
- 11 | Q. Okay. Please continue.
- 12 | A. "I truly forgive you for telling on me, but now we got to
- 13 | find a way to fix this. Lately" --
- 14 Q. What did you mean by "telling on me"?
- 15 A. You know, because, like, the way Laila works is -- is you
- 16 do something she doesn't like.
- MR. BEN'ARY: Objection. Nonresponsive to the
- 18 question.
- 19 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 20 Q. Let me ask you this. I withdraw that question.
- 21 At this point in time, when you wrote this letter,
- 22 | were you aware whether or not Ms. Sheehy had met with law
- 23 | enforcement?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Were you aware of -- as to whether or not she had

- 1 discussed with law enforcement the events surrounding
- 2 Mr. Brown's shooting and killing?
- $3 \mid A$ . Yes.
- 4 Q. When you reference in this letter about "telling on me,"
- 5 | what are you referring to?
- 6 A. Her saying that I was the one that murdered Mr. Brown.
- 7 | Q. And when you go on to say, "We have to find a way to fix
- 8 | this," what did you mean by that?
- 9 A. You need to stop what you're doing. Like, you're playing
- 10 | with my livelihood. Like, this isn't funny anymore. Like,
- 11 | you have to tell the truth.
- 12 Q. Now, if you can --
- 13 MR. JENKINS: Court's indulgence.
- 14 THE COURT: Yes, sir.
- 15 (A pause in the proceedings.)
- 16 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 17 | Q. I want to show you a different portion of the first page.
- 18 | Can you read that portion for the jury?
- 19 A. "The Feds are going to make it seem to the jury that you
- 20 | are lying for me because you are my girlfriend, and we have to
- 21 | do whatever we can to make them think otherwise."
- 22 | O. What did you mean by that, Mr. Palma Flores?
- 23 A. Basically, you know, since she was my girlfriend, you
- 24 know, she gave a false testimony on me. If she were to say
- 25 | anything else rather than a false testimony she gave to the

- 1 | police, they'd think she's trying to cover up for me because
- 2 | she's my girlfriend.
- 3 | Q. So when you go on to say that we -- "we have to do
- 4 | whatever we can to make them think otherwise," what are you
- 5 | meaning by that?
- 6 A. You know, like, you got to start telling the truth.
- 7 | Like, you can't keep on lying on me.
- 8 MR. JENKINS: Go down to the last line of the first
- 9 page. The last two.
- 10 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 11 | Q. Now, here you say, "All they showed me was an audio
- 12 | recording of..." What are you referring to?
- 13 A. My old lawyer, before you, set up a -- I don't know if it
- 14 | was a meeting with the prosecutor or if the prosecutor made a
- 15 | meeting with them, but they showed us an audio recording of
- 16 | Laila accusing me of killing Mr. Brown.
- 17 | Q. When you heard that audio recording of Ms. Sheehy
- 18 | accusing you of killing Mr. Brown, how did it make you feel?
- 19 A. I was devastated.
- 20 MR. JENKINS: Go to the second page at the top. The
- 21 | first line.
- 22 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 23 Q. Now here in the letter you write that "You snitching on
- 24 me," what did you mean by that?
- 25 | A. After the audio recording, you know, I was -- you can

- 1 | tell she was putting the blame on me.
- 2 Q. Now, I want to take you down just a little bit further.
- 3 Now, in this page of the letter, again there's a reference to
- 4 | an attorney. That first reference is to your first attorney,
- 5 | correct?
- 6 A. It says the same --
- 7 Q. It says, "Also, attorney would also always tell me that
- 8 | you are cooperating with them." That's in reference to your
- 9 | first attorney, correct?
- 10 A. Oh, I'm sorry. I was looking at the little magnified
- 11 part. It says, "The same and sounds the same, so my whole
- 12 game plan is that you say..."
- 13 Q. Okay. Let me ask you about that portion that you just
- 14 read. What did you mean by "the same and sounds the same so
- my whole game plan is that you say"? What did you mean by
- 16 | that?
- 17 A. That, you know, basically, she was trying to make it seem
- 18 like I was to blame for what happened to Mr. Brown, so it's,
- 19 like, you got to start telling the truth, like, you can't keep
- 20 | lying on me, and due to the fact that, you know, she would say
- 21 one thing and then say another thing, it was, like, you're all
- 22 over the board.
- MR. JENKINS: Go to the next page, page 3.
- 24 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 25 Q. Takes you to page 3 of your letter. Now, here you say,

- 1 "Do anything to Fort or Forf." What is Forf?
- 2 A. Forf is, like, another term for a person. Well, it has
- 3 | multiple meanings, but it just depends the way you want to use
- 4 | it.
- 5 Q. How did you intend it when you wrote it here in your
- 6 letter?
- 7 A. I was talking about Mr. Brown.
- 8 Q. You go on to say, "Also, when we went to Forf..."
- 9 Is that Mr. Brown?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 | Q. "Mr. Brown's crib we were with Jason." Now, who is
- 12 Jason?
- 13 A. Jason is my friend.
- 14 Q. Was it true that Jason went with you to Mr. Brown's
- 15 | apartment?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 | Q. Why are you saying that in this letter?
- 18 A. Because, basically, when I told my lawyer what happened
- 19 and, you know, that he was sending -- he was trying to get in
- 20 | contact with Laila. He really wasn't trying to listen to me,
- 21 | and he was making me try to take a plea deal instead, and I
- 22 | was, like, I'm not taking a plea deal because I didn't do
- 23 anything.
- 24 Q. Had you talked to Jason, at this point in time, about
- 25 | what had happened with Mr. Brown?

- 1 A. Before I got incarcerated, I did.
- 2 Q. Let me take you to page 4 of your letter, top three
- 3 | lines.
- 4 Can you read the top three lines for the jury?
- 5 A. "Also, when the Feds would not be able to" -- "also, the
- 6 | feds would not be able to prove we are lying because after
- 7 | everything we can say we..."
- 8 Q. When you say "The Feds would not be able to prove we are
- 9 | lying, " what are you referring to?
- 10 A. The police.
- 11 | Q. Why would -- did you have concerns that the quote/unquote
- 12 | "Feds" would think you were lying?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Why?
- 15 A. Because before I got booked, Detective Wallace was making
- 16 | it seem like I'm the one that killed Mr. Brown.
- 17 | Q. Were you concerned that law enforcement would not believe
- 18 | you that it was someone else who had killed Mr. Brown?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 MR. BEN'ARY: Objection to leading questions.
- 21 | THE COURT: Watch your form, Mr. Jenkins.
- MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 23 If we can go down to the middle of the same page --
- 24 from here to here. Yes.
- 25 BY MR. JENKINS:

- 1 Q. Now, Mr. Palma Flores, could you read this to the jury?
- 2 A. "Thing, bae, was that in your statement, you gave" -- "in
- 3 | that statement, you said so much incriminating evidence. So
- 4 | the only way you can..."
- 5 Q. Who are you referring to as "bae"?
- 6 A. Laila.
- 7 | Q. And what do you mean by this?
- 8 A. Um.
- 9 Q. That she said "so many" -- "so much incriminating
- 10 | evidence." What do you mean by that?
- 11 A. After hearing the audio recording, you know, she, you
- 12 know, said a whole bunch of lies and put the whole blame on
- 13 me.
- 14 Q. I think I have one final question concerning the letter.
- 15 | If you can go to page 5.
- Now, Mr. Palma Flores, in this portion of your
- 17 | letter, you mentioned a person by the name of Bryant. Do you
- 18 | see that?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Who is Bryant?
- 21 A. Bryant is my friend.
- 22 Q. And you also discuss in this portion of the letter Jason?
- 23 A. Correct.
- 24 Q. And Jason was another friend of yours, correct?
- 25 A. Correct.

- 1 Q. And in this portion of the letter, you seem to be
- 2 | suggesting that Jason and Laila have a conversation with
- 3 | Bryant, correct?
- 4 A. Correct.
- 5 THE COURT: Just a second, Mr. Jenkins. Somebody's
- 6 hungry out there. Yes, sir, thank you.
- 7 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 8 Q. Why did you want Jason and Laila to speak with Bryant?
- 9 A. Because while I was in the ADC, I was hearing that
- 10 | Mr. Worlds was bragging about killing Mr. Brown.
- 11 Q. And what role did you want Mr. Bryant to play?
- 12 A. You know, basically, just see if what he was saying was
- 13 true.
- 14 Q. Now, did you know someone who used the alias or nickname
- 15 "Slutty C"?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. Who is Slutty C?
- 18 A. That's my friend, Christian.
- 19 Q. And Christian is also mentioned in the letter, correct?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Go to page 8. Now, can you read that portion for the
- 22 jury?
- 23 A. Yes.
- "It's Kollin because in the letter I said go" --
- 25 | "just go to Slutty." But Jason has a cousin named Christian,

- 1 | and his name is Slutty -- C on Snap.
- 2 Q. So in this portion, what did you intend by this portion
- 3 of the letter?
- 4 A. Basically, you know, Laila wrote me a letter basically
- 5 | informing me that --
- 6 MR. BEN'ARY: Objection.
- 7 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 8 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 9 Q. You can't -- you can't tell us about that, okay?
- But just tell us what you meant by this, what did
- 11 | you want to have happen?
- 12 A. Basically, she told me not to --
- 13 MR. BEN'ARY: Objection.
- 14 THE COURT: Sustained.
- MR. JENKINS: I'll move on, Your Honor.
- 16 THE COURT: Thank you.
- 17 MR. JENKINS: If I can have Government Exhibit 48B
- 18 displayed for the witness.
- 19 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 20 Q. Mr. Palma Flores, take a look at the screen. Do you
- 21 | recognize this exhibit?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Do you remember when it was introduced into evidence?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. I want you to take a look at -- the 5th line. Can you

- 1 | highlight the 5th line from the top?
- 2 First of all, do you recognize the -- is this
- 3 | Instagram account or Snapchat? Tell me, what is it?
- 4 A. If I'm not mistaken, that's Kollin's Snapchat account.
- 5 Q. Which one, is it the Slutty Boy K or Spillgates?
- 6 A. Slutty Boy K.
- 7 Q. And do you know whose account Spillgates is?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Who is it?
- 10 A. Kollin's cousin.
- 11 Q. Now, are you familiar with the address 6147 Les Dorson
- 12 Lane?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 | O. Where is that?
- 15 A. If it's not Jason's house, I know it's in Jason's
- 16 neighborhood.
- 17 Q. Now, this message was sent from your phone, correct?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Who sent this message?
- 20 A. Kollin.
- 21 Q. When did he send it? What's the time?
- 22 A. It says Saturday, October 26, 20:21:43.
- 23 Q. And this is a message that Kollin sent from your phone to
- 24 | this other individual, correct?
- 25 A. Correct.

- 1 Q. If I can have you come down 1, 2, 3, 4. Were you
- 2 | familiar with Mr. Brown's Snapchat account?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. I'm sorry, one more, Mr. Qwa Brown.
- 5 And do you recognize his Snapchat account on this
- 6 | exhibit?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Is it in the highlighted portion?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And this appears to be a message from Mr. Brown to who?
- 11 A. Kollin.
- 12 Q. And again, was this sent from your phone?
- 13 A. No. It says from Qwa Brown to Slutty Boy K, so that
- 14 | means it was sent from Mr. Brown's phone.
- 15 Q. Now, do you see the time that's noted on this
- 16 | communication?
- 17 A. It says Saturday, October 26, 4:25:09.
- 18 Q. At the time that this message was sent, was your phone in
- 19 | your possession?
- 20 A. No.
- MR. BEN'ARY: Sorry, can we have the Court's
- 22 indulgence?
- THE COURT: You may.
- 24 (Counsel confers.)
- MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Your Honor.

- 1 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 2 Q. At the time this message was sent, were you physically in
- 3 possession of your phone?
- 4 A. No.
- 5 Q. Who had your phone?
- 6 A. Kollin did.
- 7 | Q. And you heard the detective testify that this message was
- 8 | sent approximately five minutes before the first 911 call,
- 9 | correct?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Now, can you go to the next message?
- Now, this is sometime later, correct?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 | O. And who?
- MR. BEN'ARY: Sorry. It's, like -- it's earlier --
- MR. JENKINS: It's early. That's right. It goes to
- 17 | opposite. I'm sorry, go back up one to the one just before
- 18 | the "Bro, you're blowing me up." Okay.
- 19 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 20 Q. Now, again, this is from the same Slutty Boy K account,
- 21 | correct?
- 22 A. It's from Zachchasin ky2sluttyboyk (ph).
- 23 Q. And Slutty Boy K is Kollin, correct?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. At the time this message was sent, where was your phone?

- 1 A. With Kollin.
- 2 Q. Did you know Kollin was communicating with Mr. Brown on
- 3 your phone?
- 4 A. No.
- 5 Q. Did you ask him to communicate with Mr. Brown on your
- 6 phone?
- 7 A. No.
- 8 Q. The --
- 9 MR. JENKINS: Court's indulgence.
- 10 THE COURT: Yes, sir.
- 11 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 12 Q. Now, Mr. Palma Flores, on yesterday, it was admitted into
- 13 | evidence the extraction from your cell phone; do you remember
- 14 | that?
- 15 A. Correct.
- 16 | Q. Do you remember the video depicting you at a gun range
- 17 | displaying a firearm?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Was that you?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Had you been to a gun range before?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. In that video, do you remember what type of firearm were
- 24 | you in possession of? The video is not up.
- 25 | A. Oh, like I said, I'm not too good with guns so I wouldn't

- 1 | know, but I just know it was -- me and my friend, Will, went
- 2 to the shooting range. I took my AR-15 and he took his two
- 3 guns, and we were both just shooting at the range, and I
- 4 | borrowed his two guns and he borrowed my AR.
- 5 Q. Do you know what kind of gun you borrowed from your
- 6 | friend, the handgun?
- 7 A. No.
- 8 Q. Now, you also heard the testimony of Detective Wallace
- 9 about the search of your residence, correct?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. And in that search, it yielded a firearm, correct?
- 12 A. Correct.
- 13 Q. Is that the AR-15 you just referred to in your testimony?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. It also yielded a number of ammunition; you heard that
- 16 | testimony, correct?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Ammunition for the AR-15, correct?
- 19 A. What's two different types of ammunition?
- 20 THE COURT: Watch the form of your questions.
- MR. JENKINS: Yes.
- 22 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 23 Q. What were the types of ammunition recovered from your
- 24 home?
- 25 A. If I'm not mistaken, the rifle caliber was a .223, and

- 1 | then the smaller one was a .45-caliber bullet.
- 2 Q. Mr. Palma Flores, on yesterday, you heard Ms. Laila
- 3 | Sheehy testify about you disposing of a weapon; do you
- 4 remember that testimony?
- 5 A. Correct.
- 6 Q. Did that occur?
- 7 A. Never.
- 8 Q. At any point in time, did you own a GLOCK 9-millimeter?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. Now, from your phone extraction, there was a photograph
- 11 or a video of you holding a gun box; do you remember that
- 12 testimony?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Can you explain to the ladies and gentlemen of the jury
- 15 | about the circumstances surrounding that video?
- 16 A. I mean, you know, when a gun -- when you buy a gun,
- 17 | usually, it comes in a box or a package and, you know, I was
- 18 just taking a picture with the package, the box that it came
- 19 in.
- 20 Q. Mr. Palma Flores, did you shoot Mr. Brown?
- 21 A. No.
- 22 O. Did you kill Mr. Brown?
- 23 A. No.
- 24 | Q. Were you present, near his residence when he was shot and
- 25 | killed?

1 Α. Yes.

5

7

8

10

12

14

15

22

23

2.4

25

2 MR. JENKINS: Your Honor, I have no further 3 questions.

THE COURT: What we're going to do is we're going to 4 take a little bit of a comfort break at this point. 6 us who have been in the court the entire time have been here for a good two hours, so maybe an hour and a half. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we're going to take a real short break, about ten minutes for comfort. My plan is to allow you to get to eat your lunch sometime between 1:00 and 1:30, that's the 11 goal. So if you need to get a little snack or something to get you through the rest of the late morning, early afternoon, that's fine. So we'll come back in at about -- I think that 13 clock says about noon. Is that what it says?

MR. BEN'ARY: It says noon, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Yeah, about ten after 12:00. Okay.

17 (Jury dismissed.)

18 THE COURT: Mr. Ben'Ary, how long do you think 19 you're going to need on your cross?

20 MR. BEN'ARY: I'll be as quick as I can, Your Honor.

21 Maybe 20 minutes to 25 minutes.

> THE COURT: All right. Mr. Jenkins, based upon that representation of a 20-minute cross -- ladies and gentlemen, you can have a seat, I'm sorry.

> > Based on that representation of a 20-minute cross,

- 1 maybe ten on rehab, if you need it.
- 2 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: All right. That should put us somewhere around quarter of 1:00 or thereabout.
- 5 Do you anticipate any additional witnesses, Mr. --
- 6 MR. JENKINS: I do not, Your Honor.
  - Do you anticipate a case in rebuttal?
- 8 MR. BEN'ARY: I don't anticipate it right now, but 9 we're going to have to see where this goes.
- 10 THE COURT: I understand. I understand. As I said,
- 11 I'm just trying to spin a few plates at the same time. Okay.
- 12 | I will -- we'll look to maybe having the jury go out for their
- 13 | lunch break at 1:00, and maybe if we're to that point
- 14 instructing them once they come back from their lunch break,
- 15 and then you all can look forward to closing arguments if
- 16 applicable after the instructions.
- 17 And again, as I indicated earlier, I prefer
- 18 | instructing the jury before the closing arguments, that way
- 19 | the lawyers get the benefit of having the instructions with
- 20 | them if they want to make specific reference to them so that
- 21 | will be the goal.

7

- 22 All right. While we're -- at this point, young man,
- 23 | you can step down and go back over with Mr. Jenkins.
- 24 (Witness excused.)
- 25 THE COURT: We'll be in recess until about 12:10.

THE BAILIFF: All rise. This court stands recess.

2 (Recess.)

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

3 (Court proceedings resumed at 12:27 p.m.)

THE COURT: Ready to bring the jury back in?

MR. BEN'ARY: Yes, sir.

6 (Jury present.)

THE COURT: You may be seated, ladies and gentlemen.

I know I ask you this every time, but, ladies and gentlemen, you've lived up to the Court's instructions not to discuss the case or any aspect of the case with anyone?

With the work we're doing today, everyone is going to get in their steps, so that's a good thing if you've got your little monitor and you're going to be ready for the rest of the day, but we appreciate your time and attention.

Mr. Ben'Ary.

MR. BEN'ARY: Thank you, Your Honor.

17 CROSS-EXAMINATION

- 18 BY MR. BEN'ARY:
- 19 Q. Good afternoon, sir.
- 20 A. How are you doing, sir?
- 21 Q. Doing well. Thank you.
- Mr. Jenkins asked you a handful of questions about
- 23 this occasion at your house on or about October 25th of '19
- 24 | where Qwa set up to have someone come purchase marijuana; do
- 25 | you remember that?

- 1 A. That's correct.
- 2 Q. And on that occasion, you, in fact, possessed marijuana,
- 3 | correct?
- 4 A. Correct.
- 5 Q. And you intended to distribute or sell it or give it to
- 6 | someone, correct?
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 Q. And that happened at your -- the house where you lived
- 9 | with -- with your family in Fairfax County, correct?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 | Q. And you had a gun during that deal, correct?
- 12 A. Correct.
- 13 Q. You testified that you pulled it out because Elijah
- 14 | started to approach you afterwards; do you remember that?
- 15 A. Well, once I seen two people, like I said, come to the
- 16 | backyard, that's when I went to go get a gun. Because I'm,
- 17 | like, who are these people, because Qwa said only one friend
- 18 | was coming. So, yes, to answer your question, I did possess a
- 19 gun.
- 20 | Q. And you possessed that gun in connection with your
- 21 | marijuana trafficking, correct?
- 22 A. Correct.
- 23 Q. And it was a handgun, correct?
- 24 A. Correct.
- 25 Q. Not the AR-15 that was seized in December at your house

- 1 | during the search warrant; is that right?
- 2 A. No.
- 3 Q. Now, you were not the only person to live in that home,
- 4 correct?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Who else lived there with you?
- 7 A. My mother, my sister, my nephew; that's pretty much it.
- 8 Q. How old is your nephew, sir?
- 9 A. I think now he should be five or six.
- 10 Q. So back in 2019 when this armed drug deal occurred in the
- 11 | backyard, he was three, two?
- 12 A. Two or three.
- 13 Q. And this is the same house where you kept a loaded AR-15
- 14 | rifle, correct?
- 15 A. Correct.
- MR. BEN'ARY: Pull up 12H, please.
- 17 BY MR. BEN'ARY:
- 18 Q. Is that the AR-15 rifle that you kept in the house with
- 19 | your young nephew?
- 20 A. Correct.
- 21 Q. And you also had handguns in the house, correct?
- 22 A. Not handguns, one handgun.
- 23 Q. Okay. Well, let's look at 47A, please.
- 24 (Video played.)
- 25 BY MR. BEN'ARY:

- 1 Q. Now, that is a handgun, correct?
- 2 A. Correct.
- 3 | Q. And that has -- is a handgun with an extended magazine
- 4 | that holds lots of rounds, right?
- 5 A. Correct.
- 6 Q. And we'll watch the rest of the video now.
- 7 MR. BEN'ARY: Go ahead, please.
- 8 (Video played.)
- 9 BY MR. BEN'ARY:
- 10 Q. The second gun, also a handgun, but it's a smaller frame
- 11 | than the first one, right?
- 12 A. Correct.
- 13 Q. The first gun is consistent with about a .45-caliber
- 14 | firearm; is that right?
- 15 A. Correct.
- 16 Q. And the second one consistent with a 9-millimeter
- 17 | handgun; isn't that right?
- 18 A. Um, I thought it was -- well, it was my friend's handgun,
- 19 but I thought it was a .45 and a .40-caliber handgun.
- 20 Q. And the reason that someone posts a video like this to
- 21 | their social media accounts is a warning to people who might
- 22 | try and rob someone of money and marijuana, correct?
- 23 A. Incorrect, sir.
- 24 Q. Now, when your residence was searched in December of
- 25 | 2019, there were no handguns there, correct?

- 1 A. Correct.
- 2 Q. And there was no 9-millimeter ammunition, correct?
- 3 A. Correct.
- 4 Q. There were three .45-caliber rounds in a show box,
- 5 | correct?
- 6 A. Correct.
- 7 Q. So let's go back real quick and talk about what happened
- 8 | after this marijuana deal where Charles snatched the marijuana
- 9 and ran.
- 10 After the shooting, there was a lot of talk over
- 11 | social media about that event, correct?
- 12 A. Correct.
- 13 Q. And some of the talk out there was about how you were too
- 14 | scared to use your gun to prevent that robbery; isn't that
- 15 | right?
- 16 A. Correct.
- 17 | Q. People were posting about it making it seem like you were
- 18 | soft, correct?
- 19 A. Correct.
- 20 | Q. And that is not the reputation that a marijuana dealer
- 21 | wants to have, is it?
- 22 A. Incorrect.
- 23 Q. Because if people think you're soft, they're going to
- 24 | target you for more robberies of marijuana and more robberies
- 25 | for money, correct?

- 1 A. I mean, it's not like I'm trying to make a lifestyle or
- 2 | hobby out of this, it was just I sold, you know, little
- 3 | quantities of marijuana to my close friends.
- 4 Q. And even Qwa Brown basically dared you to come and get
- 5 | him, didn't he?
- 6 A. I never recalled seeing anything like that.
- 7 Q. And so, in response to this, in response to word getting
- 8 out on the street that you were soft, you engineered a plan to
- 9 | lure Qwa out of his house so you could kill him; isn't that
- 10 right?
- 11 A. No, sir.
- 12 Q. You brought your 9-millimeter GLOCK, consistent with the
- 13 | smaller of the two guns from the video because it was easier
- 14 | to conceal than the larger .45, correct?
- 15 A. No, sir.
- 16 Q. You knew that Kollin Worlds was friends with Qwa, so you
- 17 | contacted Kollin even though you hadn't hung out with him in
- 18 at least months, correct?
- 19 A. No, sir.
- 20 Q. Picked up Kollin in Mount Vernon Square Apartments,
- 21 | correct?
- 22 A. Correct.
- 23 Q. And then you went and switched cars so that your mother's
- 24 | minivan wouldn't be seen in the area around Qwa's residence,
- 25 | correct?

- 1 A. No, sir.
- 2 Q. You used Kollin's Snapchat to lure Qwa Brown out of his
- 3 house, correct?
- 4 A. No, sir.
- 5 Q. Qwa Brown was just sitting on the steps when you
- 6 | approached; isn't that right?
- 7 A. No, sir.
- 8 Q. And you fired three shots, one that struck his shoulder,
- 9 and then he ducked, bending forward to avoid being shot a
- 10 | second time; isn't that right?
- 11 A. No, sir.
- 12 Q. And then you shot him in the top of the head and left him
- 13 | to bleed to death on the steps of his own home; isn't that
- 14 | right, sir?
- 15 A. No, sir.
- 16 Q. And you went back to the car and left the area, correct?
- 17 | A. No, sir.
- 18 Q. You went to your cousin, Hector's house, where you burned
- 19 | some clothes, correct?
- 20 A. Correct.
- 21 Q. And then after that, you went and had a meal at IHOP; is
- 22 | that right?
- 23 A. Correct.
- 24 Q. Since being charged, sir, you've been engaged in a
- 25 | attempt to convince people to lie for you; isn't that right?

- 1 A. No, sir.
- 2 Q. You tried to convince Jason to lie for you; isn't that
- 3 | right?
- 4 A. I wouldn't say lie.
- 5 Q. You tried to convince your sister, Jasmine, to lie for
- 6 | you; isn't that right?
- 7 A. No. I mean, I lied about my alibis, where I was that
- 8 | night, but besides that, I haven't told Jasmine to lie about
- 9 anything.
- 10 Q. Well, Jason delivered that letter, Exhibit 34 to Laila,
- 11 | didn't he?
- 12 A. I think so.
- 13 Q. And when asked about it by authorities, he lied and
- 14 | claimed it wasn't him. Do you know that?
- MR. JENKINS: Objection, Your Honor.
- 16 THE COURT: Cross-examination overruled.
- 17 BY MR. BEN'ARY:
- 18 Q. Do you know that to be the case?
- 19 A. I didn't.
- 20 | Q. And Jasmine told authorities that you were home the whole
- 21 | night; are you aware of that?
- 22 A. Correct.
- 23 | Q. And that's a lie, isn't it?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 MR. BEN'ARY: Can I ask that the witness be shown

- 1 | Government's Exhibit 34, which is in the exhibit binder,
- 2 please?
- 3 THE CSO: 34?
- 4 MR. BEN'ARY: 34.
- 5 BY MR. BEN'ARY:
- 6 Q. This is the letter that you wrote to Laila that you had
- 7 | smuggled out of the jail, correct?
- 8 A. Correct, sir.
- 9 Q. Now, your testimony on direct, I believe, is that your
- 10 | goal in sending this letter was to get Laila to tell the truth
- 11 | that it was really Kollin who committed the murder, not you,
- 12 right?
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
- 14 Q. That would be a really important thing to happen for you,
- 15 | right?
- 16 A. I mean, yeah, I'm being charged for a crime I didn't do.
- 17 | Q. And if, in fact, it was Kollin that committed this murder
- 18 and not you, you would have every reason for all of the
- 19 | authorities to know about it, correct?
- 20 A. I mean -- what do you mean by that?
- 21 Q. Are you not sure that you would want the law enforcement
- 22 authorities to know that it wasn't you that committed the
- 23 murder?
- 24 A. Of course.
- 25 O. Of course.

- But instead of sending this through the mail, you
- 2 | had it smuggled out with an inmate who was getting released,
- 3 | correct?
- 4 A. Yes, sir.
- 5 Q. And you had every opportunity to alert the authorities
- 6 | that it was really Kollin and not you, didn't you?
- 7 | A. I never had a opportunity.
- 8 Q. And you testified that Detective Wallace contacted you
- 9 | within days of the murder, didn't she?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. Well, at that point, did you tell her that it was really
- 12 | Kollin that did it?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. Okay. And you testified on direct it's because you were
- 15 | afraid of the police, right?
- 16 A. What do you mean?
- 17 | Q. I thought that was your direct testimony when Mr. Jenkins
- 18 | was asking you about this, you, I think, indicated you were
- 19 | afraid of police so that caused you some issue?
- 20 A. Yeah. I mean, especially after this incident, like --
- 21 | Q. I'm not talking about after this incident; I'm talking
- 22 | about a day or two after this shooting that you didn't commit,
- 23 | having an opportunity to tell the police that it was really
- 24 | Kollin. You didn't do that; is that correct?
- 25 A. No, sir.

- 1 Q. And did I misunderstand your direct testimony that that
- 2 | was not because you were afraid of Detective Wallace?
- 3 A. Well, I wasn't necessarily afraid of Detective Wallace;
- 4 | it's just, I don't know, like, I feel like I'm a young
- 5 | minority, like, if you look at the news, like, I feel like the
- 6 | police isn't meant for us, like, they don't protect us.
- 7 Q. Well, fair enough.
- 8 In any event, you write this letter to Laila and
- 9 | your goal is to get her to just tell the truth, right?
- 10 A. Yes, sir.
- 11 Q. All right. Do you have that in front of you?
- 12 A. The letter that I wrote?
- 13 Q. Correct.
- 14 A. Correct.
- 15 Q. It's eight and a half or so pages of single-space
- 16 | handwriting on it, right?
- 17 A. Correct.
- 18 Q. Take a moment there. I want you to point out for members
- 19 of the jury, all the times in there where you say "tell the
- 20 | truth." Take a minute, sir.
- 21 (A pause in the proceedings.)
- 22 BY MR. BEN'ARY:
- 23 Q. All right. Mr. Palma, let me try and help you out here.
- 24 | There's not one time when you say "tell the truth" in this
- 25 | letter; is that right?

- 1 A. Yes, sir.
- 2 Q. Not a single time in eight and a half pages do you tell
- 3 | the person who has the key to your freedom to just tell the
- 4 truth, do you?
- 5 A. No, sir.
- 6 Q. That's because the contents of this letter are not the
- 7 | truth; it's a game plan to save your skin, correct?
- 8 A. No, sir.
- 9 Q. You do everything you can to get as many people here to,
- 10 | as you say, cause some confusion in the court so that the jury
- 11 | doesn't find you guilty, right? Is that correct?
- 12 A. No, sir.
- 13 Q. Mr. Palma, you killed Qwa Brown because he robbed you of
- 14 | a zip, an ounce of marijuana; isn't that right?
- 15 A. No, sir. Mr. Brown didn't rob me of anything.
- 16 Q. Well, fair enough.
- 17 You killed Qwa Brown because he set you up for a
- 18 | robbery; isn't that right?
- 19 A. No, sir.
- 20 Q. And that robbery was of an ounce of marijuana, correct?
- 21 A. Yes, sir.
- 22 Q. When you stood there at the bottom of those steps at 7112
- 23 | Fairchild Drive, did Qwa Brown even see you coming?
- 24 | A. I don't know what you're talking about, sir.
- 25 Q. What was the look in Qwa Brown's eye, sir, when you

- 1 | pulled that trigger and ended his life?
- 2 A. I didn't pull no trigger, sir.
- 3 MR. BEN'ARY: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 4 THE COURT: Redirect.
- 5 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 6 BY MR. JENKINS:
- 7 Q. Mr. Palma Flores, briefly.
- 8 Who robbed you of the marijuana?
- 9 A. Some guy named Charles and Elijah.
- 10 Q. Was Qwa Brown there?
- 11 A. No.
- MR. JENKINS: No further questions, Your Honor.
- 13 THE COURT: Thank you. You may step down, sir.
- 14 (Witness excused.)
- 15 THE COURT: Next witness, Mr. Jenkins.
- MR. JENKINS: Your Honor, the defense rest.
- 17 THE COURT: Very good.
- 18 Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, at this point, the
- 19 parties in the matter have rested.
- Is the government calling any case in rebuttal? I'm
- 21 sorry.
- MR. BEN'ARY: May I have one moment, please? I
- 23 | think the answer is no --
- 24 THE COURT: Sure.
- 25 MR. BEN'ARY: -- but allow me to consult with

co-counsel.

2 (Counsel confers.)

MR. BEN'ARY: No, Your Honor, there's no rebuttal.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir.

The case is set now for me to give you the instructions. What I'm going to do is I'm going to go ahead and let you take your lunch break now. And then when we come back we'll go ahead and instruct you on the law that you are to apply in deciding this case. Please do not discuss the case or any aspect of the case with anyone.

We have a nice big area for you to spread out and have your lunch. It's okay to have casual conversation. I want you to understand that that is not the prohibition, but please do not discuss the case or any aspect of the case with anyone.

We should probably have you back in here -- I'd like to have you back in here by 1:30, which means more like 1:40. So we'll shoot for 1:30, and I will see you then. Enjoy your lunch, ladies and gentlemen.

(Jury dismissed.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, you can be seated. Thank you.

Mr. Jenkins, I'm sure you're going to want to renew the motion that you made at the conclusion of the government's case. And now, obviously, with the standard changing, do you

want to highlight anything for the Court?

MR. JENKINS: No, Your Honor. I would renew the motion, Your Honor, and I don't have any additional argument. I think the Court is familiar with the arguments and also now had the benefit of the additional testimony, and I trust that the Court can -- I can reserve it to the Court's judgment.

approach. The Court believes under the circumstances presented and the evidence presented at this point that the motion on behalf of Mr. Palma Flores is appropriate, and the Court denies the same for the reasons previously articulated and for the additional information provided after the defendant presented its case-in-chief.

Counsel, I think we're pretty close to where we need to be on the instructions. What we're going to do is this:

Now that we're -- we are where I think we need to be, I'm going to run 14 copies for the members of the jury, then we'll have a separate copy for you. I will have them in the order that I pretend to read them, and so you'll have the benefit of that.

As I said earlier, if I inadvertently state something wrong or misread something, just raise your hand, and we can go back and revisit it. I usually get pretty good, but I'm imagining it's going to take me about 45 minutes. So I am not infallible, so I will call on you to let me know if

something has gone wrong as far as the instructions are concerned.

Mr. Palma Flores, again, I've asked you this question several times throughout the course of this proceeding. And I have observed your lawyer who has worked very hard for you and has done what I believe to be an excellent job. But I need to ask you, are you entirely satisfied with the services of your counsel?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very good, sir.

All right. I'm going to direct that we take

Mr. Palma Flores back downstairs so that he can get a bite to

eat. For any people that are still in the courtroom, please

understand that you're not to have any contact with any of the

jurors or any other persons who are involved in the course of

this litigation, accordingly.

Obviously, the prosecution team can meet and confer and the defense team can meet and confer, but the bottom line is parties -- people who are outside the parties of the litigation or officials of the Court are instructed not to do anything which could undermine the ability of this Court to provide justice in the disposition of this case.

And I remind everybody that the Court does have certain inherent powers, contempt powers, to address any concerns that run afoul of the Court's specific instruction in

```
92
 1
    that regard.
 2
              Thank you.
 3
               (Lunch Recess 12:49 p.m.)
 4
               (Court proceedings resumed at 1:41 p.m.)
 5
              MR. JENKINS: Your Honor, I apologize for my tardy
 6
    return from lunch.
 7
              THE COURT:
                          That's fine. We were all trying to
 8
    return as quickly as we could.
 9
              Anything else we need to do before we bring the jury
10
    in?
11
              MR. BEN'ARY: I don't believe so, Your Honor.
12
              THE COURT: Counsel, on instruction number M, I'm
13
    going to change one word because it says in each of the
14
    arguments and before the arguments of counsel, instead of each
    on the very first one.
15
16
              THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, do you all have a
17
    verdict form that you --
18
              THE COURT: Still waiting on one, Ms. Tinsley?
19
              THE CSO: Yes.
20
               (A pause in the proceedings.)
21
               (Discussion off the record.)
22
              MR. BEN'ARY: Sir, the parties just noticed one
23
    deletion to instruction UU. And, actually, UU is the
    definition of a controlled substance but then underneath it
24
25
    says, "For the jury to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that
```

- 1 | the defendant..." and it says "Conspired to possess,
- 2 possessed with intent to distribute marijuana." So I think it
- 3 | just -- or "conspire to..."
- 4 THE COURT: Do we have the right tense?
- 5 MR. BEN'ARY: Well, it's not a conspiracy. So it's
- 6 | just possess with the intent to distribute marijuana.
- 7 THE COURT: It's to remove "conspire to."
- 8 MR. BEN'ARY: Correct.
- 9 MR. JENKINS: Correct, Your Honor.
- 10 THE COURT: All right.
- MR. BEN'ARY: Apologies. You know, these get
- 12 recycled over and over and sometimes stuff like that creeps
- 13 | in.
- 14 THE COURT: It's fine. On instruction lettered A,
- 15 | as I indicated, I'm going to put, instead of received in this
- 16 | trial and before the arguments of counsel. And then in the
- 17 | fourth paragraph, counsel will quite properly refer to some of
- 18 | the items, et cetera.
- 19 (Jury present.)
- 20 COURT'S INSTRUCTION
- 21 THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen, there's
- 22 | a bit of a miscommunication. We were all sitting here because
- 23 | we thought one of you had not gotten back and so we were
- 24 | sitting and we said, Well, do we need to send someone out to
- 25 | find this juror? And Ms. Tinsley informed me that you all

were back there, so we wasted a little bit of time, but that's okay.

So, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we've all been able to live up to the Court's instruction not to discuss the case or any aspect of the case with anyone. Very good.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, now I'm going to instruct you on the law that you are to apply in this case.

And then the lawyers will have an opportunity to tell you how they believe the evidence should be considered. You'll have a copy of these instructions for each of you when you go back to deliberate.

Members of the jury, now that you've heard all the evidence that is to be received in this trial and before the arguments of counsel becomes my duty to give you the final instructions of the Court as to the law that is applicable to this case. You should use these instructions to guide you in your decisions. All the instructions of law given to you by the Court, those given to you at the beginning of trial, those given to you during the trial, and these final instructions must guide and govern your deliberations. It is your duty as jurors to follow the law stated in all of the instructions of the Court to apply these rules of law to the facts as you find them to be from the evidence received during the trial.

Counsel will quite properly refer to some of the applicable rules of law in their closing arguments to you.

If, however, any difference appears to you between the laws stated by counsel and that as stated by the Court in these instructions, you, of course, are to be governed by the instructions given to you by the Court.

You're not to single out any one of the instructions alone as stating the law but must consider the instructions as a whole in reaching your decisions. Neither are you to be concerned with the wisdom of any rule of law stated by the Court. Regardless of any opinion you may have as to what the law ought to be, it would be a violation of your sworn duty to base any part of your verdict upon any other view or opinion of the law than that given in these instructions of the Court just as it would be a violation of your sworn duty as the judges of the fact to base your verdict upon anything but the evidence received in this case.

You were chosen as jurors for this case -- for this trial in order to evaluate all of the evidence received and to decide each of the factual questions presented by the allegations brought by the government and the second superseding indictment and the pleas of not guilty by the defendant.

In resolving the issues presented to you for a decision in this trial, you must not be persuaded by bias, prejudice, or sympathy for or against any of the parties in the case or by any public opinion. Justice through trial by

jury depends on the willingness of each individual juror to seek the truth from the same evidence presented to all jurors here in the courtroom and to arrive at a verdict by applying the same rules of law as now being given to you -- to each of you in these instructions of the Court.

There is nothing particularly different in the way that a juror should consider the evidence in a trial from that in which any reasonable and careful person would deal with any very important question that must be resolved by examining facts, opinions, and evidence. You are expected to use your good sense in considering and evaluating the evidence in the case. Use the evidence only for those purposes for which it's been received and give the evidence a reasonable and fair construction in light of your common knowledge of the natural tendencies and inclinations of human beings.

If the defendant be proved guilty by a reasonable doubt, say so; if not proved guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, say so. Keep constantly in mind that it would be a violation of your sworn duty to base a verdict upon anything other than the evidence received in the case and the instructions of the Court. Remember as well that the law never imposes upon a defendant in a criminal case the burden or duty of calling any witnesses or producing any evidence because the burden of proving guilt beyond a reasonable doubt is always with the government.

The evidence, in this case, consists of the sworn testimony of the witnesses, regardless of who may have called them, all exhibits received in evidence, regardless of who may have produced them, all facts which may have been agreed to or stipulated, and all facts and events which may have been judicially noticed. When the attorneys on both sides stipulate or agrees to the existence of a fact, you may accept the stipulation as evidence and regard that fact as proved. You are not required to do so, however, since you are the sole judges of the facts.

Any proposed testimony or exhibits to which an objection was sustained by the Court and any testimony or exhibit ordered stricken by the Court, must be entirely disregarded by you. Anything you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must be entirely disregarded. Questions, objections, statements of counsel are not evidence in the case.

You are to base your verdict only in the evidence received in your case. In your consideration of the evidence received, however, you are not limited to the bald statements of the witnesses or the bald statements in the exhibits. In other words, you're not limited solely to what you see and hear as the witness testified or as to any exhibits that are admitted. You are permitted to draw the -- from the facts which you find have been proved such reasonable inferences as

you feel are justified in light of your experience and common sense.

There are two types of evidence which are generally presented during a trial. Direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. Direct evidence is the testimony of a person who asserts or claims to have actual knowledge of a fact such as an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is the proof of a chain of facts and circumstances, indicating the existence of a fact. The law makes no distinction between the weight or value to be given to either direct or circumstantial evidence. Nor is a greater degree of certainty required of circumstantial evidence than of direct evidence. You should weigh all the evidence in the case.

Inferences are simply deductions or conclusions which reason and common sense lead the jury to draw from the evidence received in the case. In the absence of evidence in the case to the contrary, you may infer but not compel to infer that official duty has been regularly and properly performed, that private transactions — bless you — have been fair and regular, that the ordinary course of business or employment has been followed, that things that have happened according to the ordinary course of nature and ordinary course of habits of life and that the law has been obeyed. When evidence has been received in the case, concerning any of these questions, you should be guided by the evidence in the

application of your common sense.

2.4

If any reference by the Court or by counsel to matters of testimony or exhibits does not coincide with your own recollection of that event, it is your recollection which should control during your deliberations and not the statements of the Court or of counsel. You are the sole judges of the evidence received in the case.

The questions asked by a lawyer for either party to this case are not evidence. If a lawyer asks a question of a witness which contains an assertion of fact, therefore, you may not consider the assertion by the lawyer as any evidence of that fact.

Only the answers are evidence.

The defendant is not on trial for any act or any conduct not specifically charged in the second superseding indictment.

Testimony and or exhibit can be admitted into the evidence during a trial only if it meets certain criteria or standards. It is the sworn duty of the attorneys of each side of a case to object when the other side offers testimony and exhibits which the attorney believes is not properly admissible under the rules of law. Only by raising an objection can a lawyer request and then obtain a ruling from the Court on the admissibility of the evidence being offered by the other side.

You should not be influenced against an attorney or their client because the attorney has made an objection. Do not attempt, moreover, to interpret my ruling on objections as somehow indicating how I think you should decide the case. I am simply making a ruling on a legal question regarding that particular piece of testimony or exhibit.

There has been evidence that the defendant made statements about the case prior to trial. You may use that evidence, however, only to help you decide if the defendant said something different earlier and if what the defendant said here in court was true. You must not, however, consider what was said earlier as any proof of evidence of the guilt of the defendant for the crimes charged in the second superseding indictment.

I instruct you that you must presume the defendant to be innocent of the crimes charged. Thus, the defendant, although accused of crimes in the second superseding indictment, begins the trial with a clean slate with no evidence against him.

The second superseding indictment, as you already know, is not evidence of any kind. The defendant is, of course, not on trial for any act or crime not contained in the second superseding indictment. The law permits nothing but legal evidence presented before the jury and Court to be considered in support of any charge against the defendant.

The presumption of innocence alone, therefore, is efficient to acquit the defendant.

The burden is always upon the prosecution to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. This burden never shifts to a defendant, for the law never imposes upon a criminal defendant in a criminal case the burden or duty of calling any witnesses or producing any evidence.

The defendant is not even obligated to produce any evidence by cross-examining the witnesses for the government. It is not required that the government prove guilt beyond all possible doubt. The test is one of reasonable doubt. Unless the government proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant has committed each and every element of the offense charged in the second superseding indictment, you must find the defendant not guilty of the offenses.

You are here to determine whether the government has proven the guilt of the defendant for the charges in the second superseding indictment beyond a reasonable doubt.

You're not called upon to return a verdict as to the guilt or innocence of any other person or persons. So if the evidence in the case convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt that the guilt of the defendant for the crimes charged in the second superseding indictment, you should so find, even though you may believe that one or more other unindicted persons are also guilty. But if any reasonable doubt remains in your mind

after impartial consideration of all the evidence in the case, it is your duty to find the defendant not guilty.

A separate crime is charged in each count of the second superseding indictment. Each charge in the evidence pertaining to it should be considered separately by the jury. The fact that you may find the defendant guilty and not guilty as to one of the counts, should not control your verdict as to any other count.

The rules of evidence ordinarily do not permit witnesses to testify as to their own opinions or their own conclusions about important questions in the trial. An exception to this rule exists as to those persons who are described as expert witnesses. An expert witness is someone who, by education or by experience, may have become knowledgeable in some technical scientific or other specialized area. In such -- if such knowledge or experience may be of assistance to you in understanding some of the evidence or in determining a fact, an expert witness in that area may state an opinion as to a matter in which he or she claims to be an expert.

You should consider each expert opinion received in evidence in this case and give it such weight, if any, as you think it deserves. You should consider the testimony of an expert witness just as you consider other evidence in this case. If you should decide that the expert -- that the

opinion of an expert witness is not based upon sufficient education or experience, or if you conclude that the reasons given in support of the opinion are not sound or you should conclude that the opinion is outweighed by other evidence, including that of other expert witnesses, you may disregard the opinion of, in part or in its entirety. As I have told you several times, you, the jury, are the sole judges of the facts of this case.

Charts or summaries have been prepared by the government and shown to you during the trial for the purpose of explaining facts that are alleged contained in books, records, and other documents which are in evidence in the case. Such charts or summaries are not evidence in this trial or proof of any fact. If you find that these charts or summaries do not correctly reflect facts or figures shown by the evidence in this case, you should disregard the charts or summaries.

In other words, such charts or summaries are used only as a matter of convenience for you, and to the extent that you find they are not in truth, summaries of facts or figures shown by the evidence in the case, you can disregard them entirely. Charts or summaries have been prepared by the government have been admitted into evidence and had been shown to you during the trial for the purposes of explaining the facts that are allegedly contained in books, records, or other

documents which are also in evidence in the case.

2.4

You may consider the charts and summaries as you would any other evidence admitted during the trial and give them such weight or importance, if any, as you feel they deserve.

Evidence relating to any alleged statement, confession, admission, or act or omission alleged to have been made are done by the defendant outside of the court and after a crime has been committed should always be considered by the jury with caution and weighed with great care. All such alleged statements, confessions, or admissions should be disregarded entirely, unless the other evidence in the case convinces you, the jury, beyond a reasonable doubt that the statement, confession, admission, or act, or omission was made or done knowingly and voluntarily.

In determining whether any alleged statement, confession, admission, or act or omission alleged to have made by the defendant outside of court and after the crime has been committed was knowingly and voluntarily made or done, the jury should consider the age, training, education, occupation, and physical and mental condition of the defendant and his treatment while in custody or under interrogation as shown by all of the evidence in the case.

Also consider all other circumstances and evidence surrounding the making of the alleged statement, confession,

or admission. If after considering the evidence you determine that a statement, confession, admission, or act, or omission was made or done knowingly and voluntarily, you need to give it such weight as you feel it deserves under the circumstances.

2.4

Your decision on the facts of this case should not be determined by the number of witnesses testifying for or against a party. You should consider all of the facts and circumstances and evidence to determine which of the witnesses you choose to believe or not believe. You may find that the testimony of a smaller number of witnesses on one side is more credible than the testimony of a greater number of witnesses on the other side.

Statements knowing and voluntarily made by the defendant upon being informed that a crime has been committed or being accused of a criminal charge may be considered by the jury. When the defendant voluntarily offers an explanation or voluntarily makes some statement, tending to show his innocence and it is later shown that the defendant knew that the statement or explanation was false, the jury may consider this as showing a consciousness of guilt on the part of the defendant since it is reasonable to infer that an innocent person does not usually find it necessary to invent or fabricate an explanation or statement, tending to establish his innocence.

Whether or not evidence as to a defendant's explanation or statement points to a consciousness of guilt on his part and a significance, if any, to be attached to any such evidence are matters exclusively within the province of the jury since you are the sole judges of the facts of the case.

And your evaluation of evidence of an exculpatory statement shown to be false, you may consider that there may be reasons fully consistent with innocence, it could cause a person to give a false statement, showing that he did not commit a crime. Fear of law enforcement, reluctance to be involved, and simple mistakes may cause a person who has committed no crime to give such a statement or explanation.

You as jurors are the sole exclusive judges of the credibility of each of the witnesses called to testify in this case and only you determine the importance of the weight, if any, that their testimony deserves. After making your assessment concerning the credibility of a witness, you may decide to believe all of the witnesses' testimony, only a portion of it, or none of it.

In making your assessment of that witness, you should carefully scrutinize all of the testimony given by that witness, the circumstances under which each witness has testified, and all of the evidence which tend to show whether a witness in your opinion is worthy of belief. Consider each

witness's intelligence, motive to falsify, state of mind, and appearance in manner while on the witness stand. Consider the witness's ability to observe the matters as to which he or she has testified and considered whether he or she impresses you as having an accurate memory or recollection of these matters.

Consider also any relation a witness may bear to either side of the case, the manner in which each witness may be affected by your verdict, and the extent to which, if at all, each witness is either supported or contradicted by other evidence in the case. Inconsistencies or discrepancies in the testimony of a witness or between the testimony of different witnesses may or may not cause you to believe -- excuse me -- to disbelieve or discredit such testimony.

Two or more persons witnessing an incident or a transaction may simply see it or hear it differently.

Innocent misrecollection, like failure of recollection, is not an uncommon human experience. In weighing the effect of a discrepancy, however, always consider whether it pertains to a matter of importance or an insignificant detail and consider whether discrepancy results from innocent error or from intentional falsehood.

After making your own judgment or assessment concerning the believability of a witness, you can then attach such importance or weight to that testimony, if any, that you feel it deserves. You will then be in a position to decide

whether the government has proven the charges beyond a reasonable doubt.

The testimony of a defendant should be judged in the same manner as the testimony of any other witness.

The testimony of an immunized witness, someone who has been told either that their crimes would go unpunished in return for their testimony or that their testimony will not be held against them in return for their cooperation from the government, must be examined and weighed by the jury with greater care than the testimony of someone who is appearing in court without the need for such an agreement with the government.

Elijah Kyle-Canady and Kollin Worlds may be considered to be immunized witnesses in this case. The jury must determine whether the testimony of any immunized witness has been affected by self-interest or by the agreement they have with the government or by their own interest in the outcome of the case or by prejudice against the defendant.

The testimony of a drug or alcohol abuser must be examined and weighed by the jury with greater care than the testimony of a witness who does not abuse drugs or alcohol. Elijah Kyle-Canady, Kollin Worlds, Laila Sheehy, Hector Flores may be considered to be abusers of drugs or alcohol. The jury must determine whether the testimony of the drug or alcohol abuser has been affected by drug or alcohol abuse or the need

for drugs or alcohol.

The testimony of a witness may be discredited or at least sometimes, say, impeached, by showing that he or she previously made statements, which are different than or inconsistent with his or her testimony here in court. The earlier inconsistent or contradictory statements are only admissible to discredit or impeach the credibility of the witness and not to establish the truth of these earlier statements made somewhere other than here during the trial.

It is the province of the jury to determine the credibility of a witness who has made prior inconsistent or contradictory statements. If a person has shown to have knowingly testified falsely concerning any important or material matter, you, obviously, have a right to distrust the testimony of such an individual concerning other matters. You may reject all the testimony of that witness or give it such weight or credibility as you may think it deserved.

You should judge the testimony of the defendant in the same manner as you judged the testimony of any other witnesses in the case.

A second superseding indictment is only a formal method used by the government to accuse the defendant of a crime. It is not evidence of any kind against the defendant. The defendant is presumed to be innocent of the crimes charged. Even though the second superseding indictment has

been returned against the defendant, the defendant begins this trial with absolutely no evidence against him. The defendant has pled not guilty to the second superseding indictment and, therefore, denies that he is guilty of the charges.

2.4

The second superseding indictment charges that the offense alleged in Counts 1, 2, and 3 were committed on or about or in or around a certain date. Although it's necessary for the government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the offenses were committed on a date reasonably near the dates alleged in counts 1, 2, and 3 of the second superseding indictment, it is not necessary for the government to prove that the offense was committed precisely on the date charged.

Intent and motive are different concepts that should never be confused. Motive is what prompts a person to act or fail to act. Intent refers only to the state of mind with which the act is done or omitted. Personal advancement and financial gain, for example, are two well-recognized motives for much of human conduct. These praiseworthy motives, however, may prompt one person to voluntary acts of good while prompting another person to voluntary acts of crime. Good motive alone is never a defense whether the act done or omitted is a crime. The motive of the defendant is therefore immaterial except insofar as evidence of motive may aid in the determination of state of mind or the intent of the defendant.

The intent of a person or the knowledge that a

person possesses at any given time may not ordinarily be proved directly because there is no way of directly scrutinizing the workings of the human mind. In determining the issue of what a person knew or what a person intended at a particular time, you may consider any statement made or acts done or omitted by that person, and all other facts and circumstances received in evidence, which may aid in your determination of that person's knowledge or intent. You may infer, but you're certainly not required to infer, that a person intends natural and probable consequences of acts knowingly done or knowingly admitted. It is entirely up to you, however, to decide what facts to find from the evidence received during the trial.

Evidence that an act was done or that an offense was committed by the defendant at some other time is not, of course, any evidence or proof whatever that at another time the defendant performed a similar act or committed a similar offense, including the offenses charged in the second superseding indictment.

Evidence of a similar act or offense may not be considered by the jury in determining whether the defendant actually performed the physical acts charged in the second superseding indictment. Normally, such evidence be considered for any other purpose whatever unless the jury finds beyond a reasonable doubt from other evidence in the case, standing

alone, that the defendant physically did the acts charged in the second superseding indictment.

other evidence in the case that the defendant did the act or acts alleged in the particular count under consideration, the jury may then consider evidence as to an alleged earlier or subsequent act of a like nature in determining the state of mind or intent with which the defendant did the acts or acts charged in the particular count. The defendant is not on trial for any acts or crimes not alleged in the second superseding indictment. Nor may a defendant be convicted of the crimes charged even if you are to find that he committed other crimes, even crimes similar to the one charged in the second superseding indictment.

The government may prove that the defendant acted knowingly by proving beyond a reasonable doubt that this defendant deliberately closed his eyes to what would otherwise have been obvious to him. No one can avoid responsibility for a crime by deliberately ignoring what is obvious. A finding beyond a reasonable doubt of an intent of the defendant to avoid knowledge or enlightenment would permit the jury to find knowledge.

Stated another way, a person's knowledge of a particular fact may be shown from a deliberate or intentional ignorance or deliberate or intentional blindness to the

existence of that fact. It is, of course, entirely up to you whether you find any deliberate ignorance or deliberate closing of the eyes and any inferences to be drawn from any such evidence. You may not conclude that the defendant had knowledge, however, from proof of a mistake, negligence, carelessness or a belief in an inaccurate proposition.

The Court instructs you, the jury, that although the second superseding indictment may charge a defendant with committing an offense in several ways, using conjunctive language like "and," it is sufficient that the government proves the offense in the disjunctive, or that is to say the jury may convict on a unanimous finding of any of the elements of a conjunctively charged offense. Therefore, I instruct you that it is not necessary for the government to prove that the defendant did each of those things named in the particular count of the superseding indictment. It is sufficient if the government proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant did one of the alternative acts charged as long as you all agree that that same particular alternative act was committed.

Count 1 of the second superseding indictment charges that on or about October 25, 2019, in Fairfax County, Virginia, within the Eastern District of Virginia, the defendant, Melvin Palma Flores, did knowingly and intentionally and unlawfully possess with the intent to distribute a mixture and substance containing a detectable

amount of marijuana, a Schedule I controlled substance.

Specifically, one, having determined that the illegal importation, manufacture, distribution, and possession, and improper use of controlled substances have a substantial and detrimental effect on the health and general welfare of the American people, Congress enacted the Controlled Substance Act codified at Title 21 United States Code sections 801 and following: There are five scheduled -- there are five schedules of controlled substances known as Schedules I, II, III, IV, and V. Substances are scheduled depending on their potential for abuse and recognized medical usage. Marijuana is a Schedule I controlled substance. At all times, relevant to this second superseding indictment, the defendant was involved in the distribution of marijuana as a means to make money.

The defendant acquired marijuana from a source or sources of supply and redistributed the marijuana to his customers for profit. The defendant possessed firearms including for protection in carrying out his marijuana distribution activities. The defendant used a cell phone to communicate with his customers and other associates involved in marijuana distribution.

Including through online social media platforms, on or about October 25, 2019, XB contacted the defendant extensively to arrange for some of XB's associates to purchase

- marijuana from the defendant. In reality, XB and his
  associates intended to steal marijuana from the defendant. On
  or about October 25, 2019, XB's associates, individual 1 and
  individual 2 met the defendant at the defendant's home located
- 5 in Fairfax County within the Eastern District of Virginia.
- 6 The defendant had in his possession a quantity of marijuana
- 7 | that he intended to distribute to XB and his associates.

8 Instead, individual 1 stole the quantity of marijuana from the 9 defendant and brought it to XB.

During this encounter, the defendant displayed a black semiautomatic handgun but did not use it. Later that day, the defendant picked up one of his associates, individual 3 from an apartment in the Mount Vernon area of Fairfax County. The defendant and individual 3 met up with the defendant's girlfriend, individual 4. The defendant, individual 3, and individual 4 traveled in individual 4's car to the area of XB's apartment, also located in Fairfax County, Virginia.

On or about October 26, 2019, as retaliation for setting up the earlier robbery and in furtherance of his ongoing marijuana distribution business, the defendant used and discharged a firearm shooting XB twice and killing him.

The defendant also killed -- excuse me -- the defendant unlawfully killed XB with malice aforethought and that he did so from a premeditated design. After the defendant killed XB,

the defendant -- to cover up and conceal his involvement in the murder, the defendant dismantled and disposed of the firearm he used. The defendant also burned articles of clothing he had been wearing at the time.

2.4

In and around October 2020, the defendant wrote a letter addressed to individual 4. In that letter, he directed individual 4 to lie to law enforcement and say that individual 3 had committed the murder of XB rather than the defendant. He further directed individual 4 to recant individual 4's prior truthful statement to law enforcement and that the -- that the defendant had killed XB.

The defendant arranged with an identified person to deliver the letter to defendant's friend JL; JL then gave the letter to individual 4. The defendant wrote the letter and arranged for it to go to individual 4 in an attempt to corruptly persuade individual 4 with the intent to influence or prevent the testimony of individual 4 in an official proceeding and to cause or induce individual 4 to withhold her testimony from an official proceeding.

Section 841 of Title 1 of the United States Code provides in part, A, "It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly or intentionally, one, to possess with intent to distribute a controlled substance."

In order to sustain this burden of proof of the crime of possession of a controlled substance with intent the

distribute, that substance charged in Count 1 of the second superseding indictment, the government must prove the following three essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

One, that the defendant knowingly possessed a controlled substance described in the second superseding indictment.

Two, that the defendant knew that this substance was marijuana. And three, that the defendant intended to distribute some or all of this controlled substance.

The term "knowingly" as used in these instructions to describe the alleged state of mind of the defendant, means that he was conscious and aware of his actions, realized what he was doing or what was happening around him, and did not act because of ignorance, mistake or accident. Knowledge may also be inferred from a deliberate disregard for truth or falsity with a conscious purpose to avoid learning the truth.

The word possess means to own or to exert control over. The word possession can take on several different but related meanings. The law recognizes two kinds of possession. Actual possession and constructive possession. A person who has knowingly has direct physical control over a thing at a given time is then in actual possession of it.

A person who, although not in actual possession, knowingly has both the power and intention at a given time to exercise dominion over -- or control over a thing, either directly or through another person or persons, is then in

constructive possession of it. The law also recognizes that possession may be sole or joint. If one person alone has actual constructive possession of a thing, then possession is sole. If two or more persons share actual construction and possession of a thing, then possession is joint. You may find that the elements of possession, as that term is used in these instructions, is present if you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant had actual or constructive possession either alone or jointly with others.

2.4

A defendant's mere presence at a location where an item is found or his mere association with another person who possesses that item, is not sufficient to establish constructive possession. However, proximity to the item coupled with actual inferred knowledge or of his presence may be sufficient proof to establish constructive possession. Constructive possession does not require proof that the defendant actually owned the property on which the item was found.

The term "to distribute" as used in these instructions, means to deliver or to transfer possession or control of something from one person to another. The term "to distribute," includes, but is not limited to, the sale of something by one person to another.

The phrase "with intent to distribute" means to have in mind or to plan in some way to deliver or to transfer

possession or control over a thing to someone else. In attempting to determine the intent of a person, you may take into consideration all facts and circumstances shown by the evidence received in the case concerning that person.

In determining a person's intent to distribute controlled substances, the jury may consider among other things: The purity of the controlled substances, the quantity of the controlled substance, the presence of the equipment used in possession or sale of controlled substance, and large amounts of cash or weapons. The government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant intended to distribute the controlled substances alleged in the second superseding indictment.

You are instructed as a matter of law that marijuana is a controlled substance. It is solely for the jury, however, to determine whether or not the government has proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant possessed with intent to distribute marijuana, a Schedule I controlled substance.

For Count 1, the evidence received in this case need not be proved -- in this case, need not prove the actual amount of the controlled substances that were -- that was part of the alleged transaction, or the exact amount of the controlled substance alleged in the second superseding indictment as possessed with intent to distribute by the

defendant. The government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt, however, that a measurable amount of the controlled substance was, in fact, knowingly and intentionally possessed with the intent to distribute by the defendant.

It is not necessary for the government to prove that the defendant knew the precise nature of the controlled substance that were possessed with the intent to distribute. The government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt, however, that the defendant did know that some type of controlled substance was possessed with intent to distribute.

Count 2 of the second superseding indictment charged that on or about October 26, 2019, in Fairfax County,
Virginia, within the Eastern District of Virginia, the defendant, Melvin Palma Flores, did knowingly use, carry,
brandish, and discharge a firearm during and in relation to a drug trafficking crime for which he may be prosecuted -- bless you -- in the court of the United States namely; possession with intent to distribute marijuana as set forth in charge in Count 1 of the second superseding indictment. And as ongoing distribution of marijuana and knowingly and willfully causing the death of XB through the use of the firearm, such that the killing was first degree, as defined in 18 U.S.C. Section 1111(a), and that the defendant with premeditation and malice aforethought did unlawfully kill XB by shooting him with a firearm.

Sections 924(c)(1)(A) of Title 18 in the United

States Code provides in part, that it shall be unlawful for
any person, who during and in relation to any drug trafficking

crime for which a person may be prosecuted in a court of the

United States, uses or carries a firearm, or who, in

furtherance of any such crime, possess a firearm.

2.4

Section 924(j) of Title 18 of the United States Code provides in part that a person who, in the course of a violation of Section C causes a death of a person through the use of a firearm shall, one, if the killing is murder as defined in Section 1111, be punished by imprisonment for any term of years or life.

In order to sustain this burden of proof for the crimes of using — the crime of using a firearm in relation to a drug trafficking crime, resulting in death as charged in Count 2 of the second superseding indictment, the government must prove the following essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt: One, that the defendant used or carried a firearm; two, that the defendant did so in relation to a drug trafficking crime, which may be prosecuted at in federal court; and that the defendant caused the death of a person through the use of a firearm; that the killing was — and, four, that the killing was murder as defined in these instructions.

The term "murder," as used in these instructions,

means the unlawful killing of a human being with malice aforethought. The distinction between the first and second-degree murder is a presence or absence of premeditation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As used in these instructions, the term "malice aforethought" means either to kill another person deliberately and intentionally -- and intentionally or to act with callous and wanton disregard for human life. To prove malice aforethought, the government does not have to show that the government -- that the defendant -- excuse me -- harbored hatred or ill-will against the victim or others, nor does the government have to prove an intent to kill or injure. government may prove malice by evidence of conduct, which is reckless and wanton and a gross deviation from a reasonable standard of care of such a nature that you, the jury, may infer that the defendant was aware of a serious risk of death or serious bodily harm. Thus, the government need only prove that the defendant acted with a depraved heart, that is without the regard for the life and safety of others, and that a death resulted.

Premeditation involves a prior design to commit murder, but no particular period of time is necessary for such deliberations and premedication. There must be some appreciable time for reflection and consideration before execution of the act, although the period of time does not

require the lapse of days or hours or even minutes. Perhaps the best it can be said of deliberation is that it required a cool mind that is capable of reflection and a premeditation that is -- that is required that the one with the cool mind did, in fact, reflect at least for a short period of time before his act of killing.

The term "firearm" means, A, any weapon including a starting gun, which will or is designed or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosion; B, the frame or receiver of any such weapon; C, any firearm muffler or firearm silencer; or D, any destructive device. The term "firearm" does not include antique firearm. You need not find that the firearm was loaded or that it was operable at the time of the offense.

The term "drug trafficking crime" means an offense that is a felony and involves the distribution, manufacture, or importation of any controlled substances. The offense alleged in Count 1 of the superseding -- second superseding indictment possession with intent to distribute marijuana is a drug trafficking crime.

"In furtherance of" means the act of furthering, advancing, or helping forward. Therefore, as to Count 3, the government must prove that the possession of a firearm furthered, advanced, or help forward the drug trafficking crime. For drug trafficking crimes, factors that the jury may

consider in making this determination may include the following -- I'm sorry.

The type of drug activity that was being conducted, accessibility of the firearm, the type of firearm, whether the firearm was stolen, the status of the possession, whether it was legitimate or illegal, whether the firearm was loaded, the proximity of the firearm to either drugs or drug profit, the time and circumstances under which the firearm was found, whether the firearm provided defense against the theft of drugs and or reduced the probability that such a theft might be attempted. The possession is in furtherance if the purpose of the firearm is to protect or embolden the defendant.

MR. BEN'ARY: Your Honor, pardon the interruption.

14 That instruction, triple C --

15 THE COURT: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

16

19

20

21

22

23

MR. BEN'ARY: -- relates to Count 2.

The second sentence begins, "Therefore, as to

18 | Count 3" should be "Therefore, as to Count 2."

THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to read that instruction again.

Any objection?

MR. JENKINS: No objection.

MR. BEN'ARY: No objection.

24 THE COURT: The furtherance of means -- "in 25 furtherance of" means the act of furthering, advancing, or helping forward. Therefore, as to Count 2, the government must prove the possession of a firearm further -- furthered, advanced, or help forward the drug trafficking crime. For the drug trafficking crimes, factors that the jury may be consider in making this determination may include following: The type of drug activity that was being conducted, accessibility of the firearm, the type of firearm, whether the firearm was stolen, the status of the possession, whether it was legitimate or illegal, whether the firearm was loaded, the proximity of firearm to either drugs or drug profits, the time and circumstances under which the firearm was found, whether the firearm provided the defense against theft of drugs and or reduced the probability of such a theft might be attempted.

The possession is in furtherance if the purpose of the firearm is to protect or embolden the defendant.

Distribution of drugs in the common sense recognition that drug dealing is a dangerous and violent enterprise supporting inference that the defendant's possession of a firearm was to facilitate drug dealing. The frame uses or carries a firearm means having a firearm or firearms available to assist or aid in the commission of the crime identified in Count 2 of the second superseding indictment. In the determining whether the defendant used or carried a firearm, you may consider all of the factors received in evidence in the case, including the nature of the

underlying crime of violence or drug trafficking alleged, the proximity of the defendant to the firearms in question — firearm in question, the usefulness of the firearm to the crime alleged, and the circumstances surrounding the presence of the firearm.

The government is not required to show the defendant actually displayed or fired the weapon. The government is required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt, however, that the firearm was in the defendant's possession or under the defendant's control at the time that a drug trafficking crime was committed.

The use -- to use a firearm requires active employment, which includes brandishing, displaying, bartering, striking with, and firing or attempt to fire a firearm; however, would not include storing a firearm near drugs or drug proceeds.

The term "carry" requires knowing, possession, and movement conveying, transporting, or bearing the firearm in some manner; however, the firearm does not have to readily -- be readily accessible.

A firearm is used or carried in relation to a drug trafficking crime of the firearm with some purpose or effect with respect to the drug trafficking crime, and if its presence was not the result of accidents or coincidence. The firearm must facilitate or have the potential of facilitating

the drug trafficking crime. If a firearm is carried for protection or intimidation, it is carried in relation to the drug trafficking offense.

2.4

Count 3 of the second superseding indictment charges that in or around October 2020 in the Eastern District of Virginia, the defendant, Melvin Palma Flores, did knowingly attempt to corruptly persuade individual 4 with the intent to influence and prevent the testimony of individual 4 in an official proceeding and with the intent to cause or induce individual 4 to withhold her testimony from an official proceeding, namely the case of the United States versus Melvin Palma Flores in violation of Title 18 United States Code Section 1512(b)1.

Section 1512(b)1 of the United States Code provides in pertinent part that whoever knowingly uses intimidation or physical force threatens or corruptly persuades another person with intent to influence, delay or prevent the testimony of any person in an official proceeding shall be guilty of an offense against the United States.

In order to sustain its burden of proof of crime of knowingly intimating a witness as charged in Count 3 of the superseding -- second superseding indictment, the government must prove the following two essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt. One, the defendant knowingly intimidated or use physical force, corrupt persuasion against the person

identified in the second superseding indictment as a witness; and, two, that the defendant did so intending to influence, delay, or prevent the testimony of that person in an official proceeding.

2.4

The term "intimidation" as used in these instructions means the use of any words or any actions that would harass, frighten, or threaten a reasonable ordinary person to do something that person would not otherwise do or not to do something that the person otherwise would do.

The term "physical force" means physical action against another and includes confinement.

The phrase "with intent to influence, delay, or prevent testimony" means to act for the purpose of causing any person to change their testimony information in any way or to withhold testimony or information permanently or only for a period of time.

The government is not required to prove that the person to be threatened or intimidated actually felt threatened or intimidated or influenced or that there was any actual delay or withholding of that person's testimony. The government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt, however, that the defendant acted with intent to influence, delay or prevent testimony.

During the trial, you've heard testimony of a witness and argument by counsel that the government did not

utilize specific investigative techniques. You may consider 1 2 these facts in deciding whether the government has met its 3 burden of proof, because as I told you, you should look at all of the evidence or lack of evidence in deciding whether the 4 5 defendant is quilty. However, you should also -- you are also 6 instructed that there's no legal requirement that the 7 government use any specific language to prove -- or 8 investigative techniques to prove its case. Law enforcement techniques are not your concern. I'm sure that at least one 10 of you have seen the popular TV shows CSI and Law & Order. 11 The TV standards and the capabilities of law enforcement as 12 portrayed on TV and in the movies do not apply here to this trial. Witness testimony is sufficient to establish the 13 14 degree -- witness testimony is sufficient to establish the 15 charges in this case. Specific investigative techniques such 16 as DNA and fingerprints are not required to be presented in 17 order for you to find the defendant guilty of the charges in 18 Please dismiss from your deliberations in the case. 19 consideration of the appropriate verdict in this case any 20 investigative techniques which you have -- may have seen on TV 21 or in the movies as well as anything else about which there 22 was no evidence. Your concern, as I have said, is to 23 determine whether or not on the evidence or lack of evidence, 24 the defendant's guilt has been proven beyond a reasonable 25 doubt.

Upon retiring to your jury room to begin your deliberations, you must select one of your members to act as your foreperson. The foreperson will preside over your deliberations will be your spokesman here in court -spokesperson here in court -- sorry. Your verdict must represent the collective judgment of you, the jury. to return a verdict, it is necessary that each juror agree to it. Your verdict, in other words, must be unanimous. It is your duty as juror to consult with one another and to deliberate with one another with a view toward reaching an agreement if you can do so without violence to individual judgment. Each of you must decide the case for himself or herself but do so only after the impartial consideration of the evidence in the case with your fellow jurors. course of your deliberations, do not hesitate to examine your own views and to change your opinion if convinced it is erroneous. Do not surrender your honest conviction, however, solely because of the opinion of your fellow jurors or for the mere purpose of thereby being able to return a unanimous verdict.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I'm going to give you a verdict form to be presented to your foreperson and you are to fill out each one of the areas that are designated on the jury form. And I'm going to ask that in that regard that each -- the foreperson of the jury sign the documents on the

last page. There are three pages here. You'll see, as I'm illustrating here, there is a place for the foreperson to sign. The foreperson should sign the verdict after, if you all are able to reach a unanimous verdict.

2.4

Remember at all times that you are not partisans; you are judges, judges of the facts of this case. Your sole interest is to seek the truth from the evidence received during the trial. Your verdict must be based solely on the evidence received in this case.

Nothing you have seen or read outside of the court may be considered. Nothing that I have said or done during the course of the trial is intended in any way to somehow suggest to you what I think your verdict should be.

Nothing said in these instructions, nothing in any form of verdict should suggest or convey to you in any way or manner any intimation as to what the verdict I think you should return. What the verdict shall be is the exclusive responsibility of you, the jury. As I have told you many times, you are the sole judges of the facts.

The punishment provided by law for the offenses charged in the second superseding indictment as the matter exclusively within the province of the court and should never be considered by the jury in any way in arriving at an impartial verdict as to the offense charged.

You will take these forms to the jury room and when

you have reached the unanimous verdict as to your verdict, you will have your foreperson write your verdict on the form, date and sign the forms, and then return with your verdicts to the courtroom. As I've indicated throughout, Ms. Tinsley is your liaison. You just need to let her know, and we'll follow the process as it becomes necessary. If it becomes necessary during your deliberations to communicate with the Court, you may send a note, signed by your foreperson or by one or more members of the jury, through the court security officer,

Ms. Tinsley. No members of the jury should ever attempt to communicate with the Court by any means other than a signed writing, and the Court will never communicate with any member of the jury, concerning the evidence or opinion or deliberations other than in writing orally here in court.

You will note from the oath that you took -- you will note from the oath -- I have stated throughout that you are not to discuss the case or any aspect of the case with anyone, and that is to be your collective judgment as to what the responsibilities are. You should only discuss the case when all persons are in the jury room and able to deliberate. Bear in mind that you are also never to reveal to any person, not even to the Court, how the jury stands numerically or otherwise on the question of whether or not the government has sustained its burden of proof until after you have reached the unanimous verdict.

I am sending the exhibits, which have been received in evidence during the trial with you as you retire for your deliberations. These are the instructions of law that you are to apply in this case. As I indicated earlier, I will be providing to you a copy of these instructions, so you will be able to have them individually.

At this point, ladies and gentlemen, the government is entitled to present its closing argument. Then the defense will be able to present its closing arguments. Because the government bears the burden of proof throughout the proceedings, the government will have an opportunity, if it chooses to do so, to speak in rebuttal to the defense's closing argument.

You're free to move about the well.

MR. BEN'ARY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Just a second, Mr. Ben'Ary. We have a little movement in the back. Just hold up a second.

(A pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: I'm going to ask that the court security officers, who are in the back of the courtroom, preclude anyone else from coming in during the closing arguments.

Ladies and gentlemen who are here, if you need to leave, this is your time to leave. I'm not going to allow these closing arguments to be interrupted by people going in and out of that door. So if you need to leave, this is your

1 | time.

2 Thank you, Mr. Ben'Ary.

## CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. BEN'ARY: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, may it please the Court.

THE COURT: Yes, sir. Thank you.

MR. BEN'ARY: Mr. Jenkins, ladies and gentlemen of the jury.

At the beginning of the trial, my colleague,

Ms. Rumbaugh, stood up here and told you about the defendant

bringing a gun over to Qwa Brown's residence on October 26,

2019. And it was there that this defendant, Melvin Palma

Flores, lured Qwa Brown out of his house, ambushed him, and

executed him. Retaliation for a drug robbery that Qwa Brown

had set up earlier on October 25th.

The evidence in this case has shown exactly that.

And that this ambush took some planning. It took the

defendant bringing a gun, we know that he possessed, because
he testified he had with him only six hours before the

shooting at his house.

It involved the defendant finding a means to communicate with Qwa Brown in a way that wouldn't alert him that the guy that he was in this dispute with over the course of that day, October 25th, was about to come and pay him a visit so that Qwa Brown couldn't defend himself. After that,

the defendant brought in his friend, mutual friend with Qwa Brown, Kollin Worlds who happen to have Qwa Brown's Snapchat saved in his contacts. Finally, the defendant needed a ride because he couldn't show up at a scene where he was about to commit a murder in his mother's gray minivan. So he brought in Laila Sheehy.

Ladies and gentlemen, all of this planning, all of this premeditation was designed for one purpose. And we know based on the timing of the last communication between the Snapchat accounts of Kollin Worlds and Qwa Brown and then the near five minutes between the first 911 call that there was no argument, there was no fight. And, in fact, we know from the 911 call, the crime scene evidence that Qwa Brown never got off the steps. This defendant didn't give him that opportunity. Went there for one purpose and that was to shoot him and kill him and that's exactly what he did.

Ladies and gentlemen, we spent a lot of time during the course of this trial talking about corroboration, what facts corroborated with the facts. And I would submit to you respectfully at this point, after the defendant's testimony, there is a single fact that is in dispute and that is whether it was the defendant who got out of the vehicle and shot Qwa Brown or whether it was Kollin Worlds that got out of the vehicle to shoot and kill Qwa Brown. I would respectfully suggest to you that there's one version of that that makes all

of the other evidence in the case makes sense. There's another version of it that throws everything else out of whack, that causes mental gymnastics to try to understand the motivations involved, why people said what they said when they said it and just doesn't make common sense.

And I would respectfully suggest to you that the version that makes everything else consistent and match up in this case is the version that it was this defendant,

Melvin Palma Flores, that shot and killed Xyqwavius Brown on October 26, 2019.

There are three charges in the indictment that you are going to have to decide. The first one is whether the defendant possessed with the intent to distribute marijuana. And I would submit to you his testimony, I essentially asked him elements of that offense during the beginning of my cross-examination. He admitted he possessed marijuana on that date; he did it with the intent to distribute. He knew it was marijuana. Elijah Kyle-Canady told you that they smoked part of that marijuana afterwards. It was, in fact, marijuana. I would submit there's no legitimate question as to whether the defendant is guilty on that count.

The defendant likewise admitted most of the elements of Count 2, which is use of a firearm in furtherance of a drug trafficking crime resulting in death, and that it was premeditated murder. He admitted that he possessed a firearm.

He admitted he possessed it in furtherance in connection with a drug trafficking crime. And again, we are left with the one central question in the case, whether it was this defendant that fired the bullets that ended Owa Brown's life.

And ladies and gentlemen, we have more than what Mr. Jenkins referred to in his opening statement as "she said/he said." I would submit to you that, by the way, she said/he said can be enough if the she and the he are found to be credible witnesses. But here, ladies and gentlemen, it's not he said/she said. Certainly, there are hes and shes that say that it was the defendant that got out of the car. He walked a couple of hundred yards that's depicted in the photographs in evidence down to Qwa Brown's house; they hear shots, he comes running back smelling like a firecracker and directs him to go. And he goes to his cousin Hector's apartment where he brings Hector out with a lighter to burn the clothes, later telling him — later telling him that he is — his brother burned the clothes because he's murdered someone.

So there certainly is the she, Laila Sheehy, and he, Kollin Worlds, providing that -- providing that information.

However, there is much more than that. There is also telephone location records. And, of course, the defendant admits to you now that he was there. And that's the thing about business records, cell phone records, ladies and

gentlemen. They don't have a bias; they're not worried about getting in trouble. They are collected by the phone company; and when law enforcement collects them, they say what they say. And here, they say the story went — the facts — the course of that night went the way that Laila Sheehy told you, they went the way that Kollin Worlds told you, and then went now the way what the defendant has told you.

They show the defendant going to pick up Mr. Worlds around Mount Vernon Square, they should've been going up to pick up Laila Sheehy -- Sheehy in the Kingstowne area and then they show the two phones in the area of Qwa Brown's house shortly after midnight on the 10/26/2019. In addition to that, there's another "he." There is Hector Flores, defendant's cousin, who is not involved at all that night; and there is no phone records showing that he was anywhere other than perhaps his house. And he tells you that the defendant showed up late at night, calls him up, gets him out of the house, asked him to bring a lighter, the defendant burns some clothes. And then sometime later, he asked the defendant what was that about, and the defendant said "I killed someone."

Let's think about motivations, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. Hector Flores has really nothing to do with this case, I would submit, and he testified until he sees his name in this letter. And I'm going to get to the letter in a moment. He sees his name as mentioned as a potential witness

by the defendant as someone who was going to come in and concoct some story for him. And at that point, he's contacted by law enforcement, and he lets them know about what happened. That the defendant burned his clothes, that he told him he killed someone.

What's Hector's motivation at this point? What's Hector's motivation to make that story up? Of course, the defendant now says he's being truthful about the clothes.

Kollin asked me to burn the clothes so that part is true. But he's making up the other part about me saying that I killed someone. And why would Hector do that? What motivation does Hector have? Certainly not to improve familial relations in the Palma Flores family to come in and testify against your cousin who has been charged with murder falsely.

I would submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, in terms of believing whether it was the defendant or whether it was Kollin Worlds, one of the most problematic pieces of evidence, for the defendant, is his cousin Hector's testimony that the defendant not only burned his clothes that night but told Hector that he did it because he killed someone. Does it make any sense for Kollin Worlds -- for the defendant when Kollin says, Hey, burn my clothes, for the defendant to take him to his cousin's house? Why would he take him to his own cousin's house, somebody connected with him if he's not involve with the shooting? Why would he take Kollin's

clothes out and burn them for Kollin? You saw Kollin. He's 1 2 an able-bodied individual. There's no reason he couldn't use 3 a lighter just as well as the next guy. It doesn't make any sense. I would suggest to you, for this defendant to take 4 5 Kollin's clothes to his own cousin's house, someone that's 6 going to be connected to him having just been involved in this 7 situation with shots fired. I would suggest 100 percent inconsistent with Kollin Worlds being the shooter. It all 8 makes sense if, in fact, the defendant was the shooter as the

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

evidence proves in this case.

- Now, in terms of motivations, certainly, you can suggest that Kollin, if he was really the shooter, has a motivation to lie. And I suppose you can suggest that Laila has a motivation to falsify testimony because of the up and down nature of her relationship with the defendant. But look at the timing, ladies and gentlemen. Look at the timing of what Laila says -- and I should be calling her Ms. Sheehy, pardon me.
- Look at the timing of what Ms. Sheehy says when says it. You have in evidence a transcript of a 911 call that Ms. Sheehy made.
- 22 And I think this is 7B, Ms. Lee, on page 6.
- You have the actual recorded call in evidence, but there's also a transcript to help you look for it.
- Now, this 911 call comes in in December 29th, at the

- 1 | time when Ms. Sheehy is in no contact with Kollin Worlds.
- 2 | They're not friends. They haven't had romantic relationships.
- 3 | There's nothing going on between the two of them. In fact,
- 4 until about a year prior to them hooking up at this New Year's
- 5 | Eve party as they testified.
- 6 (Juror sneezed.)

straight Melvin Palma.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

7 MR. BEN'ARY: Bless you.

And what does Ms. Sheehy tell the police about this? Who is the individual? Do you remember his name? And it's butchered here, but Melvin Palmer, and then they get it

So at that point before Ms. Sheehy and Mr. Worlds are in communication at all, what motivation does she have at this point in time to say that it was Melvin Palma?

And I would suggest there's no possibility of coordination at that point. She is calling 911 to report the same version of events that she testified to during trial in this case, that it was, in fact, the defendant responsible for the shooting, not Kollin.

And then, ladies and gentlemen, we've spent a lot of time talking about Government's Exhibit 34. And this is the letter that the defendant wrote to Ms. Sheehy from jail. Giving her, basically, instructions on rounding up witnesses to testify on his behalf.

Could you just pull up the first page?

Ladies and gentlemen, as we have talked about this letter over and over again, you know that it's eight-plus handwritten pages, you've seen certainly snippets of it. I'm going to discuss some of it with you now, but I would ask and encourage and implore you all to read this whole thing as you go back to deliberate. And as you read it, think to yourself, Is this the letter of someone who is waiting in jail falsely accused, demanding that the truth get out there? Or is this the letter of someone who knows he's guilty, desperately trying to circle the wagons, to get as many witnesses in the court as possible to lie on his behalf to cause confusion so that he doesn't get convicted.

And let's talk about some of this. First of all, it starts with, "Hey, babe, in this letter, I'm going to tell you everything I can't on the phone." Again, if he was falsely accused, he would not want to hide the fact that he was falsely accused. He would be standing at the edge of the highest cliff he could find broadcasting. He would want the authority to know. I've been falsely accused. Go out there and investigate and clear me of this terrible misunderstanding. He doesn't say that. He hides it. He smuggles it out of the jail.

"I truly forgive you for telling on me but now we got to find a way to fix this." Ladies and gentlemen, remember back to when you were child and think about what it

means to tell on someone. You got caught, you know, drawing on the wall and your brother or sister told on you. It doesn't mean they are framing you for something; it means that they're reporting what happened to the authority figure, and that's exactly what Laila Sheehy did here.

And does he tell her, You need to come forward with the truth; I've been falsely accused; I've been framed? No, he says, "We got to find a way to fix this." Lately, what I have been thinking is that if they make you testify that you say the whole reason we got into an argument that night is because you wanted to tell the police that Kollin did it. I'm paraphrasing through some of it. You can read the whole thing word-for-word yourself.

"Lately what I have been thinking"; not, Hey, the truth all along is; not, Hey, I need you to say what you really know about this. Lately what I, Melvin Palma Flores, have been thinking is that if they make you testify, you say, and then he lays out his story. And guess what? It's a story that blames the whole thing on Kollin just like you heard in court during this trial. And it is 100 percent evident, I would suggest to you, ladies and gentlemen, it is clear when you read this letter in the context that that's what it is. It's a made-up story, a fabric of the defendant's imagination designed to get witnesses to lie on his behalf to obstruct justice and to escape responsibility.

He goes on. He accuses her, at the top of page 2, of snitching on him. Again, what do you understand the word "snitching" to be? Not audio recording of you making up a story of evidence of me committing this horrible crime of you snitching on me. He continues. "As of right now, bae" -- in the middle of the page -- "we all have to get our stories the same. That way when I get this attorney, everything looks the same and sounds the same."

I would suggest to you not at all. "So everything looks the same and sounds the same. So my whole game plan is that you say when we got into an argument that night was because you were tired of keeping your mouth shut" and about Kollin. It's a made-up story that it was Kollin, not the defendant.

Someone who is in jail for a murder that they did not commit and they're referring to the truth as their game plan? Ladies and gentlemen, that does not make any sense.

And then the story that gets told here that he's telling Laila to get on the same page with this, that it was Kollin, it was really Kollin's marijuana, I was just selling for him, everything that you heard from the defendant on the witness stand. You can see him making it up right here in this letter, Exhibit 34. And there's other suggestions in here, ladies and gentlemen, that makes this point absolutely clear. Bottom middle of the page, "Also, when we went to" --

uses the term "Forf," I'll say "that guy's." "Also, when we went to that guy's crib, we were with Jason, unless he had already told the police he was somewhere else during the shoot-out." Okay. So there is only one truth, either Jason was there or he wasn't there, and it doesn't matter what he told the police. He was there or wasn't there. Here, he is saying, "He was there unless he already told the police he was somewhere else." The words of an innocent, ladies and gentlemen, or the word for someone trying to circle the wagons?

Why does he want Jason to come in and say he was there? Because that way you have another witness that can confirm your story.

Next page, 4. "The only bad thing, bae, was that in your statement you said so much incriminating evidence."

Again, would it be described as incriminating evidence if she was making up a story that included him being guilty of a murder that he didn't commit? Or is it incriminating evidence because it's evidence that tends to prove his guilt of the crime of which he is accused?

The only bad thing was that in your -- in your statement you said so much incriminating evidence. The words of an innocent man, ladies and gentlemen? The only way you can reverse that is saying, like, Detective Wallace threatened you.

And you heard from Detective Wallace, you heard from Ms. Sheehy. You are the judges of the credibility of the witnesses. I would suggest to you none of this makes sense.

None of this version makes sense. It is evident that it is just a ploy to get out of responsibility for this murder that the defendant committed.

Also, next page, 5. "What I was thinking was you and Jason go to my friend, Bryant's house, and tell him this guy has not been involved. Tell him that Kollin did it, but that he put the blame on me because one time when Bryant was at the mall, he seen Kollin." Yada, yada. So maybe Bryant can come in now and be one of those other witnesses that cause some confusion. Bryant has got nothing to do with this, and the defendant is asking Laila to go put this story in Bryant's head so he can come into court to tell it to you to create confusion.

"That way" -- bottom of the page -- "the more people we have on our side, the better because that way the Feds do not even see it coming." And that's it, ladies and gentlemen. That's why the letter was smuggled out. That's why the letter was smuggled out. Because if the Feds had time to investigate this, it's going to be evident that it's all made up. Well, guess what? We didn't hear from Bryant; we didn't hear from Jason. The defendant has no burden of proof in this matter. The burden of proof stays on the government the entire time

and not suggesting otherwise. But the circling of the wagons did not work, ladies and gentlemen. And I trust and I would employ you to read this letter carefully and think through whether these are the words of an innocent man. "Tell Bryant this version of the events so he can spit it back out in court."

"Also, since you mentioned my cousin Hector" -going onto page 6 -- "you got to tell him the plan and tell
him if he is willing to testify, and say that I came to his
house not to burn clothes; I came to his house to tell him
everything, because" -- again back to the Kollin -- "I was
afraid that Kollin was going to kill me to tie up loose ends."
Well, that -- that changed, right? That changed between the
writing in this letter and today. Today, the defendant
testified he did, in fact, burn the clothes over there.

But the plan was if they could get Hector on board, the defendant could get Laila to get Hector on board was to say that he came to his house. Again, at the time that Kollin was in the car. Melvin drove over there to tell Hector, he says in this letter how scared he was of Kollin. Does that make any sense? Words of an innocent man, ladies and gentlemen?

Little further down. "If you can tell Jason, Hector, and Bryant to testify on my behalf, that is good because that way we can cause some confusion in the court,

that way the jury does not find me guilty. Because honestly,
the Feds do not have that much evidence against my" -- "except
my phone location and me lying not being there."

So here it is, again, ladies and gentlemen. This is the motivation behind this.

"That way the jury does not find me guilty because they don't have that much evidence." It's not the jury won't find me guilty because I am an innocent man, ladies and gentlemen. I didn't do this. It was Kollin, and I'm being set up. Nope. How is he going to get off? He's going to get these folks to show up to court and cause as much confusion as possible to try to get acquitted. I would suggest to you if you read that letter, it's going to be evidently 100 percent clear that that's exactly what is going on, ladies and gentlemen.

I think I will leave this to you, ladies and gentlemen, to read the rest of. The bottom line, ladies and gentlemen, is that innocent people don't write letters like this. Innocent people don't smuggle letters out of the jail asking witnesses to lie for them in federal court trials. Guilty people do this. People that shoot other people do this. In this case, the defendant who shot and killed another person wrote this letter, not because of anything he knew that is true, but because he was hoping to escape responsibility by creating confusion and pulling a wool over your eyes, ladies

and gentlemen. And I would suggest to you that you not let that happen. Ladies and gentlemen, there's one story here that makes all of the evidence make sense. And that is the version of that that includes this defendant getting out of the car, walking down that hill, and firing three shots at Qwa Brown. One going through his shoulder, and then as he ducks down -- the medical examiner's report talks about the direction of that second wound going into the top of his head and backwards and down.

Now, we spent a lot of time in this case talking about and focused on the defendant focused on Kollin Worlds, focused on Laila Sheehy. And I want to close my closing with a few words about Qwa Brown.

If you can pull up --

2.4

Ladies and gentlemen, Qwa Brown was 19 years old on October 26, 2019. And evidence in this case has shown that he made a series of choices that put him in danger. He made choices to be involved with marijuana. He made choices to involve — to be involved with others that conduct marijuana robberies. He, himself — you heard the evidence — was involved in conducting marijuana robberies.

And, in fact, he made the most dangerous choice of all which was to set up this defendant, an armed marijuana dealer, for a marijuana robbery.

None of that stuff is a good idea, ladies and

gentlemen. But Qwa Brown should have been given the opportunity to grow and live better. He had a family. He had a grandmother, Joyce Brown, that you heard from, that loved him. She didn't deserve to walk out of her apartment after her grandson lay bleeding, died on the steps up to her apartment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ladies and gentlemen, Qwa Brown bears some responsibility for putting himself in a dangerous situation, but this defendant had no right to be the judge, jury, and executioner. This defendant had no right to lure him out of his home. This defendant had no right to point a gun at him. This defendant had no right to fire three shots at him. At any point, prior to those shots being fired, this defendant could have walked away. That's why it's premeditated murder. He had a chance to walk away. He had the entire evening. had all the way to the time when he was walking down the steps to that apartment. He could have walked away at any time. He could have chose not to pull the qun. He could have chose to yell at Qwa Brown. He could have chose to try and grab his weed back and run. He didn't. He chose to shoot him and kill him, and there's nothing anyone can do to bring Joyce Brown her grandson back. Qwa Brown paid the ultimate price for his poor decisions. He got a much more severe punishment, I would suggest, than he deserved.

Now, it's time that you hold this defendant

accountable and we ask that you find him guilty of all three counts.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

Anybody that thinks they need to leave at this point, can leave. If some people are standing outside of the door, they can come in. Does anybody need a water? No takers.

Mr. Jenkins.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Your Honor.

## CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. JENKINS: May it please the Court --

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. JENKINS: -- Mr. Palma, government counsel.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I want to start off by thanking you for paying very close attention to the evidence as it has come in here today. I know this is a difficult case. A young man lost his life and that is tragic. I join the government counsel in expressing how bad it was for Ms. Brown to have to see her grandson in that condition. And, yes, I also concur that young Mr. Brown made some poor choices and as a consequence of those choices, he placed himself in harm's way. I also agree that sadly he was shot and killed as a consequence of those poor choices. But as I told you in the very beginning, beyond the government's theory, this case was simply about she said and he said. The judge has instructed

you about how you should go about applying the law to the evidence in this case.

And I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that after a fair and impartial consideration of the evidence in this case, and not with sympathy, passion, or prejudice for anyone involved in this case, the only true verdict you can return with respect to Mr. Melvin Palma Flores, specifically with respect to Count 2, is not guilty. Because, ladies and gentlemen, I told you in the very beginning, this case was not about whether or not Melvin Palma Flores engaged in marijuana sales. It wasn't. It wasn't going to be about whether or not young Mr. Qwa Brown engaged in marijuana sales. What this case is really about, ladies and gentlemen, is who exited that vehicle, walked down that hill, took a 9-millimeter GLOCK firearm, and fired three shots at Mr. Qwa Brown.

Ladies and gentlemen, separate out of your mind what Laila Sheehy said, what Kollin Worlds said to you, what Hector Flores said to you, what are you left with? What are you left with? No eyewitnesses, no surveillance cameras, no forensic evidence, no DNA, no fingerprints. Nothing at all. Government counsel will have you question, Well, why would Ms. Sheehy, what was her motivation to falsely accuse her on again, off again father of her child? She told you. This was a bad relationship. It has good points, but it also has its bad points. And what did she tell you happened in December of

- 1 | 2019? You heard from Detective Wallace also. They got into a
- 2 | horrible fight, a terrible fight, a fight that led to
- 3 Mr. Palma Flores being charged with some
- 4 | domestic-violence-related charges. And she told you, she was
- 5 angry with him. She wanted to get back at him. She wanted to
- 6 get him in trouble. And what did she then do? Not in
- 7 October, not in November, but in December after this incident.
- 8 For the very first time, she calls the law enforcement and she
- 9 says it was Mr. Palma Flores who committed the murder. She
- 10 | gave you her motive. She told you why she did it. She even
- 11 admitted to me on cross-examination that she regretted doing
- 12 it.
- The government would point to Kollin as the ultimate
- 14 | cooperation. So you don't have to -- according to government,
- 15 | you all have to just rely on Ms. Sheehy, you can also take the
- 16 | word of Kollin. What do we know about Kollin? He begins a
- 17 | sexual relationship with one of his closest friend's
- 18 | girlfriends. He doesn't say anything about Mr. Palma Flores
- 19 having committed this offense until when? Until Ms. Sheehy
- 20 | sends him a copy of Government's Exhibit 34, in which
- 21 | Mr. Palma Flores is clearly identifying him as the perpetrator
- 22 of the murder. And it is at that point for the very first
- 23 | time, after he gets his immunity agreement, that he meets with
- 24 | law enforcement and his story now matches right up with the
- 25 | woman who he's sleeping with. They both are saying, Yeah, we

went here, we went there that night, and it was Melvin, who got out of the car and committed the shooting. What corroboration do you have of that?

On cross-examination, government counsel tried to point out, Well, the cell site data match it up. It matches up exactly what the defendant said and what he testified. They went from point A, point B, point C, the shooting occurred and then they went to point D. That doesn't tell you that Mr. Palma Flores is not telling the truth. It certainly doesn't prove that Ms. Sheehy is telling the truth.

Ms. Sheehy tells you this fantastic story of
Mr. Palma Flores, separating the gun, throwing it away in two
different waterways. Detective Wallace said, you know,
Mr. Jenkins, you're right. Corroborating that fact would have
been significant. Corroborating that fact would have meant, I
didn't have to rely on just what Ms. Sheehy said. So
Ms. Sheehy told me where I could go, where I could find the
weapon. I called a dive team, they got together, we went to
the water, and guess what? We couldn't find the weapon.

It wasn't where she said it was.

Well, Ms. Sheehy said, Well, the ballistic evidence says the guys who collected the casing all say it was a 9-millimeter Ruger. Nobody disputes it; nobody doubts it. The defendant's home is raided. It's searched. He hasn't gotten rid of all his ammunition. He hasn't gotten rid of any

- 1 | firearms. He hasn't gotten rid of all the marijuana. It's
- 2 | all there. And guess what? No 9-millimeter rounds. A .45,
- 3 | yeah. Ammunition to fit the AR-15, yeah. No traces of a
- 4 9-millimeter. No corroboration at all. None at all.
- 5 | Kollin Worlds tells you, Hey, I was in a car; I'm going with
- 6 Mr. Palma Flores, not exactly sure where we're going, but we
- 7 | end up outside of Qwa Brown's apartment and Melvin takes my
- 8 | phone and he starts communicating, going through his Snapchat.
- 9 Where is the corroboration for that?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Detective Wallace says, Look, that wouldn't really be available. I can't tell you who was actually using the phone, who was using the Snapchat account to communicate with Qwa Brown other than what Kollin Worlds says. That's it. They dumped Mr. Palma Flores' phone, they got the cell site data for Ms. Sheehy's phone, and they dumped the phone of Mr. Qwa Brown all in an attempt to collect data to corroborate what she was saying and what he was saying. Detective Wallace told you despite her effort, despite her desire for that type of quality corroborative evidence, she was unable to present it to you. We only have Kollin Worlds saying that it was not him communicating with Qwa Brown moments before he was killed. I want you to take a look at Government's Exhibit 47. the chat record. You'll see, Kollin isn't just talking to Qwa Brown around this time. He's talking to two, three other people and the very important one before he arrives at Mr.

- Brown's apartment complex, he tells one of his friends "I'm about to go re-up." "I am about to go re-up." Why is he saying that? And where does he go? To the person who he told you he had previously gotten marijuana from. That he had previously gotten marijuana from. And it just doesn't end
- 6 there, ladies and gentlemen. After Mr. Brown has sustained
- 7 | the qunshot, there is more chat information between
- 8 | Kollin Worlds and his associates. Mr. Melvin Flores didn't
- 9 have access to his Snapchat account. He was in communication
- 10 | with Qwa Brown. It was Kollin Worlds.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, you have nothing independent of what she says or he says to say Mr. Palma Flores' story is the true story or whether or not Kollin Worlds and Laila Sheehy's story are the true story. And that, ladies and gentlemen, in our system of justice is the definition of reasonable doubt. Do you have a reasonable basis to doubt what the government's charges are against this And without any independent cooperation, ladies and gentlemen, there has to be some doubt in your mind. You have to be sitting here after hearing all the testimony wondering, was it Palma Flores, or was it Kollin Worlds? Is Sheehy credible? Is she telling the truth? Who's telling the truth? God, I wish I had some physical evidence to back it up. Man, if only there was a surveillance camera. If only an innocent bystander was standing by and could identify who was the

1 shooter. If only his fingerprint had been found on a casing.

2 | If only the murder weapon had been found. If only bullets

3 | matching those used to end Mr. Brown's life had been found in

possession of anyone. And then maybe, ladies and gentlemen,

5 | you could resolve those doubts in your mind.

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

And government says put Ms. Sheehy aside, put Mr. Worlds aside. We understand -- honestly, he didn't say it but I'll say it. We got some problems with these two. We got some problems with these two. They used drugs, one of them, admitted, got some mental health issues, clearly has some issues with the defendant, clearly. I don't want -- they don't want you to hang the case just on those two. So they want you to look to Hector Flores. Well, this is his cousin; why would he do that? Why would he say that? Mr. Flores pops up on the scene approximately 19 months after the shooting and killing. He doesn't call Detective Wallace within days, within weeks, within months, within a year, a year-and-a-half, 19 months later. And he says at some unknown time, unknown place, with no one else around, and no other way to corroborate the conversation even existed, my cousin just said to me, "I killed somebody." No reason. No motive. What did he tell you how he was feeling when he heard about his name being mentioned in Government's Exhibit 34?

law enforcement was going to get me involved in this. I

He said, "I was concerned." "I was concerned that

didn't want to be involved with this. I told them that Melvin told me I killed somebody." And once I did that, all of my concerns went away. No longer worried. I told them that Melvin did it. I told them that Melvin told me that he killed somebody, and all of my concerns were gone.

I'll close by spending some time on Government
Exhibit 34. And I agree with Mr. Ben'Ary; you got to read it.
You got to start from the top of page 1 and you got to go all
the way to the bottom of page 8. Mr. Ben'Ary has his
characterization of the portions, and I certainly have mine.
And we both have taken you through those segments, those bits
in which we believe support the government's theory and
supports the defense. As the Judge says, you're the judges of
the fact. And Mr. Palma Flores is not afraid of that.
Government counsel says, Why would an innocent person smuggle
a letter out, write a letter to his girlfriend, trying to
craft his defense, explaining what actually happened, making
sure that she rounds up witnesses, making sure that he has an
adequate defense? He told you.

See, for some people in our communities, law enforcement, the criminal justice system is something to be trusted. It's something that you can rely on. Law enforcement are just here to serve everyone's interest to be guided by the facts and see to it that the right people are held accountable. And then there are others in our community

like Mr. Palma Flores told you. That's not his view of law 1 2 enforcement. No, when she first came to me, I lied. Why did 3 you lie, Mr. Palma Flores? I don't trust cops. I'm a young, Hispanic male, and in my view, cops aren't really here to help 4 5 I'm concerned. I don't want to be involved. I lied. My sister Jasmine, she lied, too. We both said, I was at home. 6 7 That wasn't true, Mr. Jenkins. It wasn't true. He told you 8 why. He told you he didn't want to get involved. He told you he didn't trust them. He told you and he says it in the 10 letter. He doesn't trust his lawyer, who he's being 11 represented at that time. He doesn't trust the jail phone. 12 He doesn't trust the jailers who inspect his mail. He doesn't 13 want them to know what his defense is going to be at trial. 14 He said, They're not going to believe me. He says it in the 15 That's why he wrote the letter. You don't have to 16 agree with him, you don't have to share his views. But is it 17 so unreasonable that those are his views? And why he did what 18 he did.

Ladies and gentlemen, suspicion, probability,
likelihood, none of that is enough to find someone guilty
beyond a reasonable doubt in our American system of justice.
You don't have to approve of how Mr. Palma Flores was good in
his life. You can disagree with him. You can even think ill
of how he was good in his life. But he deserves the same
protections of our constitution as every other citizen of whom

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you might approve of. I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, apply the law to the facts of this case and find my client not guilty of Count 2. Thank you.

THE COURT: Rebuttal from the government.

MR. BEN'ARY: Thank you.

## REBUTTAL CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. BEN'ARY: Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to be brief and let you get to your deliberations here. And again, the defendant's goal as stated in the letter was to cause confusion in the court and find him not guilty, and that's what you're seeing in this -- at this point of the trial.

Mr. Jenkins asked you to separate, I think, he said the testimony of Laila, Kollin, and Hector. Okay, that's -- that's 3 out of 12 government witnesses. May as well separate all of the government's case and then there's no evidence at all. You can't separate and disregard, I would submit, their testimony. You got to look at it in connection with one another, in connection with what you know about human nature, and again, the only thing that makes everything else in the case that makes sense was that it was the defendant that is responsible for this shooting.

Mr. Jenkins -- and if I'm -- if I misheard him, you guys are the ones who judge the facts and credibility so I apologize. But I think that Mr. Jenkins told you in the arguments or suggested in the arguments just now that

Mr. Worlds came forward after Ms. Sheehy shared the letter with him. And I want to talk quickly about the chronology of events here.

2.4

Laila makes the 911 call, according to the defendant in December 2019.

Government's Exhibit 15, if you want to pull that up, please, Ms. Lee.

This is the proffer letter that gives Mr. Worlds immunity from us, using his statements against him if they're truthful is dated January 2020. Exhibit 34, the letter that we've talked so much about, comes out months and months later and later 2020 and the testimony was that Laila and Kollin hook up New Year's Eve 2021, and in January 2021, she shares the letter with Mr. Worlds. Mr. Worlds, I would submit, is not accurate to his statement. He did not come forward with information until after Ms. Sheehy shows him the letter. He was dealing with the U.S. Attorney's Office and law enforcement more than a year in January of 2020, and the letter that was shared in January of 2021.

Could you pull up 48B quickly, please?

This is the chat log that we're talking about, and I think it's on the second page of that message comes in, "I'm going to re-up."

So again, it's your interpretation that controls, but I would suggest to you -- okay. Message from Kollin

Worlds's Snapchat account to whoever this Marks2kj is. "No, I'm about to go re-up right now."

And remember, this is UTC. One of our -- I think it was Detective Wallace that told you, you got to subtract four to get to Eastern Standard Time. So this comes in at -- what's 21 minus 4? It comes in 7 o'clock on 25th -- on the 25th. This is during the time when Kollin is going to meet up but has not yet met up with Mr. Palma. So this isn't about going to meet up with Qwa, I would suggest to you, this is about Kollin going to meet up with Mr. Palma Flores, who has just contacted him and said, Hey, let's go smoke. This is -- this before they are together, I would suggest to you, based on the evidence you've heard. So I would suggest that it's not probative of what Mr. Jenkins suggested to be probative of.

All right. The motivation for Ms. Sheehy to make the 911 call in December of 2019, Mr. Jenkins suggests is because they've been in this fight and the defendant had assaulted her. But remember back to her testimony, and she was difficult to understand; she had the mask on. It was a strain to listen and hear her testimony, but what I would suggest, and it's your recollection that controls, but I would suggest what she said was that fight happened because he had found that she had looked up how to contact Fairfax County Homicide. So it wasn't the fight that caused the motive. It

was the motive that caused the fight.

She wanted to call the police and tell them that it was Melvin and Melvin beat her up. Not the other way around.

Let's see. Oh, Mr. Jenkins wants you to focus on who was using the Snapchat account to contact Qwa Brown. And I would suggest to you, ladies and gentlemen, that that is far less important in your decision on this case than who used the gun to shoot Qwa Brown. That's what we're here about. And again, the evidence I would suggest to you points to one person, and that is the defendant.

Mr. Jenkins says if only there was an innocent bystander, if only there's someone who wasn't there who could just tell us what happened here. Ladies and gentlemen, Hector is an innocent bystander. Hector wasn't involved. Hector wasn't involved. He was involved because the defendant suggested that Laila go get him to lie. And so the police go talk to him, he tells them similar to what he testified, I believe, the testimony was. If Hector didn't want to be involved and wanted to stay as far away as possible, wouldn't Hector had told the police, I don't remember anything; I don't want to talk to you; I don't want to be involved. That would have been a way to get away from this case entirely. Hector didn't want to get in trouble for providing false testimony for obstructing justice, so he told -- I would suggest to you -- he told the police the truth that the defendant burned

his clothes with his help and that some months after or some weeks after he asked the defendant; the defendant admitted that he did -- he conducted the shooting.

Ladies and gentlemen, again, read that letter closely. I would submit to you it is not the letter of someone who is trying to get the truth to come out. It is someone who is trying to frustrate the legal process because he understands he's in a lot of trouble. I would suggest to you the evidence that supports convictions on all three counts. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

2.4

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, the matter has been submitted to you for your deliberations. As I instructed you earlier, your first order of business when you go back to the deliberation room is to select a foreperson, and he or she should make sure that the deliberations go forward in a precise and orderly manner. There will be no deliberations unless all members of the jury are present to participate in the process.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's 3:30 now. I think that after you select your foreperson, maybe if you could let us know how long you want to go today and then the Court will take that into consideration but again communicate through Ms. Tinsley through a written note through your foreperson. All right.

Ms. Armentrout.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Juror Number 10, Teresa Doyle; and Juror Number, 9 Obed Diaz, you all were selected as alternate jurors.

Before you all leave during, let me THE COURT: explain, during the course of the litigation, particularly during the pandemic, we select a couple of people, and depending on how long the trial was going to be, to be alternates in the matter. That's if someone gets sick or we have a circumstance that we cannot predict, we like to make sure that we have some people who are able to participate in the process, who have been full participants in the trial. The fact that you were an alternate is no less important than the other 12 individuals who are going to actually deliberate in the case. Your time and attention was just as important, but again, we had to select two alternates; they were done at random, and so on behalf of the parties to the action in the Eastern District of Virginia, I want to thank the two of you for participating at this point.

Please do not discuss the case or any aspect of the case with anyone because your service continues. If we have the misfortune of having a juror not able to participate, we will bring you back in and you will be part of the deliberative process. So the instruction I've given you continues to exist. If, as you leave, you could give

- 1 Ms. Tinsley your cell number or number where we can get in
- 2 | contact you -- contact with you, that is much appreciated.
- 3 | But again, we thank you for your participation and please
- 4 | adhere to the rule that the Court has imposed throughout this
- 5 litigation. And once again, thank you. I'll go ahead and
- 6 | release the two alternates right now.
- 7 Ms. Tinsley, if you could walk them out.
- 8 Ms. Doyle and Mr. Diaz. Thank you, ma'am. Thank
- 9 you, sir.
- 10 (Alternate jurors excused.)
- 11 THE COURT: Other than reading an hour of
- 12 | instructions, that's the thing that I least like to do as a
- 13 | judge in the case is dismiss people who have been attentive
- 14 | and careful and responsible to their task as jurors, but now,
- 15 | you are the 12 who will deliberate in this case. We will have
- 16 written copies for each of you of the instructions that I read
- 17 | to the Court. If your first order of business could be to
- 18 | select your foreperson, and then let us know how long you'd
- 19 like to stay today, that would be appreciated.
- I would suggest that if you are intending on coming
- 21 back tomorrow, that a good time to be back would be 9:00 a.m.
- 22 | I have other things on my docket that I'm going to do in
- 23 | another courtroom, but I will be available, and you all are
- 24 | the first priority of things that I will deal with tomorrow,
- 25 | so just let us know what your intention is. We'll wait for

167 Ms. Tinsley to come back, and then we'll go ahead and have you 1 escorted out and bring you the instructions. 2 3 (A pause in the proceedings.) THE COURT: People in the gallery, if you want to 4 leave, you may leave at this time. 5 6 Ladies and gentlemen, you can go with Ms. Tinsley 7 now. (Jurors excused for deliberations at 3:36 p.m.) 8 9 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Ladies and

gentlemen of the gallery, you can have a seat if you like. 10

Mr. Palma Flores, I need to ask you this question again. I think I know the answer to the question. Are you completely satisfied with the services of Mr. Jenkins?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If you could, counsel, approach Mr. Golden and give us your cell numbers or something that we can get in contact with you.

Mr. Jenkins, what is your -- what is your plan, sir, as far as being close, where are you going to go?

MR. JENKINS: Your Honor, you know, I keep a pretty ambitious schedule. So I may have to appeal to the Court for some assistance. I do have a matter in -- before the general district court for Prince William County tomorrow afternoon.

My intent is to contact the Court and to explain that I am

- 1 otherwise occupied.
- THE COURT: Mr. Jenkins, you're in a good position
- 3 | because I have many friends and colleagues that sit on the
- 4 | bench in the general district court of Prince William
- 5 | County --
- 6 MR. JENKINS: I imagine so. I would imagine so.
- 7 THE COURT: -- some of whom are very reluctant to
- 8 | get in my way, so.
- 9 MR. JENKINS: So if I'm at liberty to share that
- 10 | information with them about why.
- 11 THE COURT: And who is the judge?
- 12 MR. JENKINS: I do not know because it's in the
- 13 | general district court.
- 14 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. JENKINS: So I don't know who has been assigned
- 16 | to. I imagine that it's been assigned to a courtroom at this
- 17 | point.
- 18 THE COURT: Okay.
- 19 MR. JENKINS: But I don't know if I'll be able to
- 20 | find the judge's name.
- 21 THE COURT: Once you are able to find the judge's
- 22 | name, if there is an issue, just simply let me know. I think
- 23 | I have every single one of them in my contacts, so I call them
- 24 | up and let them know that -- your circumstance, and I don't
- 25 | think --

- 3 MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Your Honor. I appreciate

4 that.

5 THE COURT: Other than that, sir, where are you

6 | going to be?

- 7 MR. JENKINS: I'm going to stay here.
- 8 THE COURT: Okay.
- 9 MR. JENKINS: I may go out to my car, which is in
- 10 | the parking lot, but I believe the clerk has my cell number.
- 11 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Ben'Ary, if you could
- 12 approach with that.
- MR. BEN'ARY: We likely will go down to our office,
- 14 | but cell numbers are always best in case we're wandering
- 15 around.
- 16 THE COURT: Give that to Mr. Golden. You may
- 17 | approach Mr. Golden.
- 18 (Discussion off the record.)
- 19 THE COURT: Counsel, what we're going to do next is
- 20 have you approach and take a look at the exhibits so we can do
- 21 | the exhibit review. Please be thorough as you go through that
- 22 to make sure. For the record, I can maybe read in what I
- 23 have, and we can work from there.
- 24 (Discussion off the record.)
- 25 THE COURT: Let me compliment both counsel on their

presentation of the case. It was a vigorous and zealous prosecution. It was a vigorous and zealous defense. And it is always a pleasure for this Court to have the ability of good, young lawyers who are practicing before the Court who do their job and understand the significance of what they do. So on behalf of the judges of the Eastern District of Virginia, I want to thank you for your presentations. Okay.

Is there anything else we need to do? Anything down there? All right. Okay. Very good. Thank you.

THE BAILIFF: All rise. This court stands adjourned.

(Recess.)

2.4

THE COURT: We're back on the record of United

States of America versus Melvin Palma Flores. Representatives

from the government are present as is Mr. Jenkins, who is

representing Mr. Flores. Mr. Flores has been brought back

over for Court to answer two questions from the jury.

For the record, I'll just read in the first thing that we got back and by agreement counsel have allowed this to be resolved without the necessity of everyone being here.

Jury's first question or first suggestion was, "We have decided as a group we would like to come back fresh in the morning," signed by the foreperson. The response by the Court is, "That is fine. What time are you coming back?" And the response by the foreperson is, "We will be here at

9 o'clock a.m."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

All counsel have agreed that that communication was appropriate to be conducted without Mr. Flores present.

Is that true, Mr. Jenkins?

MR. JENKINS: That is correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Flores, did you have any problem with that being done without you being here?

(Counsel and Defendant confers.)

THE DEFENDANT: That's fine.

THE COURT: Do you have any difficulty with that,

Mr. Flores?

12 THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

More of a substantive question that came back in the next response from the jury. "Would it be possible to have a copy made of Exhibit 34 and 35 for each jury member?" I have two proposals. Obviously, whatever you all want to do by agreement is fine with me. The concern that I have initially is that it brings unnecessary attention to one exhibit over the other if we're making individual copies. And the second concern that the Court has is if we make a copy of that, then they are going to want individual copies of everything. I'll listen to you all as to what you decide you want to do.

MR. BEN'ARY: Your Honor, the United States doesn't have a problem with copies being made of those letters. I

think both sides agree that they are critical. So --

THE COURT: Mr. Jenkins.

MR. BEN'ARY: -- I think it would speed things along and perhaps the Court could say, you know, copies -- individual copies won't be made of --

THE COURT: Well, that's what I was going to say.

If that was your agreement, I was going to say we can make individual copies of each of these exhibits, but generally, we cannot make individual copies of each of the exhibits.

MR. JENKINS: Well, yeah. And certainly, I anticipated, and I think Mr. Ben'Ary did, too, that the jury might have this request. I share the Court's concern about them focusing in on one versus the other. If the Court's position is going to be that they're not going to, in response to any potential future request from them do likewise, that is make 12 copies of everything else or any other selected portions of exhibits they request, then I think the Court should not honor this request. I think the Court should be consistent with whatever you're going to do. So if they want 12 copies of Government Exhibit 47, the Snapchat, you know, communications and the Court is not going to do that, then I think the Court should not make 12 copies of this.

MR. BEN'ARY: The only additional point, Your Honor,
I would raise is that both parties during closings asked each
juror to read the entirety of the -- of the letter. So if

- 1 | they're passing it around, it's going to take a few minutes.
- 2 So I think that does sort of set 34 and 35 apart from other
- 3 exhibits.
- 4 THE COURT: Well, I think the question might not be
- 5 | as potentially sinister as we might think. I think that they
- 6 | maybe just don't want to do it for health and safety
- 7 | considerations, but that's neither here or there. What I'm
- 8 | going to say is you must share Exhibit 34 consistent with
- 9 health and safety considerations.
- And on the question, "Can we get a copy of the
- 11 transcripts?" The response I suggest is "You must use your
- 12 | collective memories for review of the evidence."
- MR. BEN'ARY: That's fine, Your Honor.
- 14 THE COURT: Mr. Jenkins.
- 15 MR. JENKINS: Yes, Your Honor. That's -- that's
- 16 | acceptable.
- 17 THE COURT: All right. All right. Ms. Tinsley, if
- 18 you could take this back. And then once they read it,
- 19 retrieve it so that we can put it in the record and check with
- 20 | them to make sure they don't have any more questions before --
- 21 | just check with them and make sure they have -- they have no
- 22 more questions before they go for the day. Thank you.
- MR. JENKINS: And, Your Honor, in the interim, is it
- 24 | the Court's policy that counsel should be present at the time
- 25 | in which the jury convenes in the morning?

1 THE COURT: No.

2.4

2 MR. JENKINS: Thank you.

Ms. Tinsley is that tomorrow when they come we'll make sure that we have all 12 of them and that she puts them to where they need to deliberate and let them start the day at 9 o'clock as opposed to bringing them back in, unless you want me to make a separate inquiry of them at the beginning of the day tomorrow, whether they were able to live up to the Court's instructions not discuss the case or any aspect of the case with anyone.

MR. JENKINS: Your Honor, I don't think that would be a bad idea, but I don't think it's necessary for counsel and Mr. Palma Flores to be present for that, if the Court is inclined to --

THE COURT: So let me make sure I understand what you're saying. You are agreeable to the Court welcoming them tomorrow morning and inquiring as to whether they have lived up to the Court's instruction without you or your client being present.

MR. JENKINS: That is correct, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Do you have any problem with that,

23 Mr. Ben'Ary?

MR. BEN'ARY: No, Your Honor. I suspected one of us will be here, but our office is here, so --

175 1 THE COURT: Okay. 2 MR. BEN'ARY: -- that's fine. 3 THE COURT: That's fine. Mr. Palma Flores, is that agreeable to you? 4 MR. JENKINS: It is not. Mr. Palma Flores would 5 6 like to be here if the Court is going to address the jury. 7 just informed me of that. 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 MR. JENKINS: Yes. THE COURT: So bring him back in, and I'll question 10 11 him. 12 Ms. Tinsley, make sure they don't have any more questions before I let people go for the day. 13 (A pause in the proceedings.) 14 15 THE CSO: I want to make sure I know where they're 16 going to be. Are they coming back here? THE COURT: They're coming back here because of the 17 18 request of Mr. Palma Flores. He wants to hear me ask them the 19 question as to whether they've lived up to the Court's 20 instruction. 21 THE CSO: Okay. (Indiscernible) question. So are 22 23 THE COURT: Unless they've got another question.

ind count. onless one, we got uncomer quescion.

THE CSO: They don't have any more question that's

25 | why I asked.

2.4

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I 1 2 think we're done for the day, and we'll see you at 9 o'clock. 3 We've got your cell phone numbers, so that we can contact you as quickly as we can. As we've seen earlier in the day, some 4 5 of the jurors are not as prompt as others, so when they all 6 are available, we'll give you a buzz within 10 or 15 minutes. 7 I'll also let you know that I'm running another docket 8 tomorrow, so I'll be running back and forth between the two 9 courtrooms. I'm going to keep everything as it is in this 10 courtroom and conduct the other docket in courtroom 601. 11 MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 13 14 (Proceedings adjourned at 4:36 p.m.) 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 2.4 25

Tonia M. Harris OCR-USDC/EDVA 703-646-1438-

## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Tonia Harris, an Official Court Reporter for the Eastern District of Virginia, do hereby certify that I reported by machine shorthand, in my official capacity, the proceedings had and testimony adduced upon the Jury Trial in the case of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA versus MELVIN PALMA FLORES, Criminal Action No.: 1:20-cr-142, in said court on the 15th day of December, 2021.

I further certify that the foregoing 177 pages constitute the official transcript of said proceedings, as taken from my machine shorthand notes, my computer realtime display, together with the backup tape recording of said proceedings to the best of my ability.

In witness whereof, I have hereto subscribed my name, this June 9, 2023.

2.0

Tonia M. Harris, RPR Official Court Reporter